This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

https://books.google.com



Digitized by Google

Phil 0L 99





HARVARD
COLLEGE
LIBRARY



Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Philol 99



HARVARD
COLLEGE
LIBRARY

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE

AMERICAN

JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY

BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE

Professor of Greek in the Johns Hopkins University

VOL. XXI

BALTIMORE: THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
LONDON: KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & Co.
LEIPSIC: F. A. BROCKHAUS

1900

Digitized by Google

Philos. 99
By Exchange



The Friedenwald Company
BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS OF VOL. XXI.

No. 81.

I.—Indo-Iranian Studies. By Louis H. Gray, ... 1

II.—The Two Recensions of Plautus, *A* and *P*^{A}. By W. M. Lindsay, . 23

III.—Chronological Studies in the Greek Tragic and Comic Poets. By Edward Capps, ... 38

IV.—The Wenzelbibel, Cod. Pal. Vindob. 2759–2764. By W. Kurrelmeyer, ... 62

V.—Notes on the Newly Discovered Elegy of Poseidippus. By Robinson Ellis, ... 76

VI.—Catulliana. By Sir E. Maunde Thompson, ... 78

Reviews and Book Notices: 80

Bennett's Critique of Some Recent Subjunctive Theories.—Allen's The Treatment of Nature in the Poetry of the Roman Republic.

Reports: 94

Hermes.—Rheinisches Museum.—Beiträge zur Assyriologie und semitischen Sprachwissenschaft.

Brief Mention, ... 107

Recent Publications, ... 113

Books Received, ... 117

Digitized by Google

No. 82.

I.—Horace, Serm. I 4: A Protest and a Programme. By G. L. Hendrickson, ... 121

II.—Tennyson and Homer. By Wilfred P. Mustard, . . . 143

III.—Prohibitives in Silver Latin. By Willard K. Clement, . . 154

IV.—Notes on Servius. By R. B. Steele, ... 170

V.—Etymological Miscellany. By Francis A. Wood, . . . 178

VI.—Some Lucretian Emendations. By W. A. Merrill, . . . 183

VII.—Some Celtic Traces in the Glosses. By Otto B. Schlutter, . 188

VIII.—The Source of the So-called Achaean-Doric κοινή. By Carl Darling Buck, ... 193

IX.—Etymology and Slang. By Edwin W. Fay, ... 197

Review: 200
Patin's Parmenides im Kampfe gegen Heraklit.

Reports: 217
Revue de Philologie.—Englische Studien.

Brief Mention, ... 229

Recent Publications, ... 236

Books Received, ... 239

No. 83.

I.—The Chthonic Gods of Greek Religion. By Arthur Fairbanks, 241

II.—Notes on Cicero's Use of the Imperfect and Pluperfect Subjunctive in *si*-Clauses. By H. C. Nutting, ... 260

III.—*Apāṁ Napāt* Again. By H. W. Magoun, ... 274

IV.—Items from the Gāthic Pahlavi. By L. H. Mills, ... 287

V.—Notes on the Modern Minsi-Delaware Dialect. By J. Dyneley Prince, ... 295

VI.—De *Quoque* Adverbio. Scripsit Guilelmus Hamilton Kirk, . 303

VII.—A Papyrus Fragment of Iliad E. By Edgar J. Goodspeed, . . 310

Note: 315
The Etymology of ΣΘΕΝΟΣ. By George Melville Bolling.

Reviews and Book Notices: 317
Brugmann's Griechische Grammatik.—Monier-Williams' A Sanskrit-English Dictionary.—Smyth's Greek Melic Poets.—Weil and Reinach's Plutarque, De la musique (Περὶ Μουσικῆς).

Reports: 334
The Journal of Germanic Philology.—Philologus.

Brief Mention, ... 350

Recent Publications, ... 355

Books Received, ... 358

Digitized by Google

No. 84.

I.—The Athenian Democracy in the Light of Greek Literature. By Abby Leach, ... 361

II.—The Ocean in Sanskrit Epic Poetry. By Washburn Hopkins, . 378

III.—The Greek in Cicero's Epistles. By R. B. Steele, . . . 387

IV.—On the Wedding Stanza, Rig-Veda, x. 40. 10. By Maurice Bloomfield, ... 411

V.—The Manuscripts of the Letters of Cicero to Atticus in the Vatican Library. By Samuel Ball Platner, ... 420

VI.—Note on Acharnians 947. By Campbell Bonner, . . . 433

VII.—The *æ/a/v* of 'are,' 'father,' 'rather.' By George Hempl, . . 438

Notes: 443

On Greek and Latin Negatives. By Frank H. Fowler.—On the Septuagint Text of I Samuel 20. 3 and Epistle of Jeremiah 26. By John Wesley Rice.

Reviews and Book Notices: 448

Schmalz's Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik.—Koch's Kaiser Julian der Abtrünnige; seine Jugend und Kriegsthaten bis zum Tode des Kaisers Constantius (331–361).—Rothstein's Die Elegien des Sextus Propertius.

Reports: 463

Philologus.—Rheinisches Museum für Philologie.

Brief Mention, ... 470

Recent Publications, ... 477

Books Received, ... 481

Index, ... 484

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

VOL. XXI, 1 WHOLE NO. 81

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
JUN 16 1900
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.
HARVARD UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

THE

AMERICAN

JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY

BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE

PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

BALTIMORE: THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
LONDON: KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & CO.
LEIPSIC: F. A. BROCKHAUS

JANUARY, FEBRUARY, MARCH
1900

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS.

I.—Indo-Iranian Studies. By Louis H. Gray, ... 1

II.—The Two Recensions of Plautus, *A* and *P*[A]. By W. M. Lindsay, . 23

III.—Chronological Studies in the Greek Tragic and Comic Poets. By Edward Capps, ... 38

IV.—The Wenzelbibel, Cod. Pal. Vindob. 2759-2764. By W. Kurrelmeyer, ... 62

V.—Notes on the Newly Discovered Elegy of Poseidippus. By Robinson Ellis, ... 76

VI.—Catulliana. By Sir E. Maunde Thompson, ... 78

Reviews and Book Notices: 80

Bennett's Critique of Some Recent Subjunctive Theories.—Allen's The Treatment of Nature in the Poetry of the Roman Republic.

Reports: 94

Hermes.—Rheinisches Museum.—Beiträge zur Assyriologie und semitischen Sprachwissenschaft.

Brief Mention, ... 107

Recent Publications, ... 113

Books Received, ... 117

Open to original communications in all departments of philology, classical, comparative, oriental, modern; condensed reports of current philological work; summaries of chief articles in the leading philological journals of Europe; reviews by specialists; bibliographical lists. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price $3.00 a year, payable to the publisher in advance; single numbers, $1.00 each. Suitable advertisements will be inserted at the following rates:

	1 time.	2 t.	3 t.	4 t.
One page	$16 00	$30 00	$40 00	$50 00
Half page	8 00	15 00	20 00	25 00
Quarter page	4 00	8 00	12 00	15 00
Eighth page	2 00	4 00	6 00	8 00

The English Agents of the American Journal of Philology are Messrs. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Paternoster House, Charing Cross Road, London, W. C.

Special Notice.—The stock of complete sets of The American Journal of Philology has passed over into the hands of the undersigned. These sets will be sold for the present at the regular price, $60 for the twenty volumes, cash to accompany the order. Single volumes, $3; single numbers, $1 each, so far as they can be supplied. Address

The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

Published quarterly. Three dollars a year (postage paid). Entered at the Postoffice of Baltimore, Md., as second-class matter.

Press of The Friedenwald Co.
Baltimore, Md.

Digitized by Google

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
JUN 16 1900
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

AMERICAN

JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXI, 1. WHOLE NO. 81.

I.—INDO-IRANIAN STUDIES.

I. a) *Ancient Persian Sibilants;*
b) *Inflection;*
c) *Translation of Behistān*, i.

PHONOLOGY.

The Ancient Persian Representation of s, z, and sp.

General literature.—Brugmann, Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik, I² 728–739, 790–792; Bartholomae, Grundriss der iranischen Philologie, I 16–18, 165 seq., 187 seq.; Hübschmann, '*g'*, *gh'* im sanskrit und iranischen,' KZ. XXIII 384–400 (for the Anc. Pers., 395–398); Persische Studien, 198–214, 220–224; Foy, 'Die indg. gutturalen spiranten im Altpersischen,' KZ. XXXV 15–29.

The inscriptions of the Anc. Pers. show a rather frequent confusion in their employment of *s* and *θ*, and of *z* and *d*. An attempt is here made to decide whether this confusion is due to dialectic differences or to a phonetic coincidence in the Anc. Pers. of *s* and *θ*, and of *z* and *d*. The material offered by the inscriptions has been given as completely as possible, and it has been done independently either of Hübschmann or of Foy, to both of whom, however, I have been frequently indebted otherwise, as will appear in my citations below. The somewhat analogous case of the representation in Anc. Pers. of Iranian *sp* by *sp* or *s* also calls for attention, and it may be most conveniently discussed after a treatment of *s* and *z*.

Digitized by Google

A. *s and θ.*

Literature.—Sievers, Grundzüge der Phonetik[4], 119 seq.; Braune, IF. IV 341 seqq.; in Sanskrit: Wackernagel, Altindische Grammatik, I 239–242; in younger Avesta (not common): Jackson, Avesta Grammar, 29; Caland, KZ. XXXIII 463 seq.; in Lakonic: Meyer, Griechische Grammatik[3], 289 seq.

Material.—The material given by the inscriptions with regard to *s* and *θ* is as follows:

1. *s.* *ayasatā* [cf. under Bh. i. §12], *aruvastam* [NRb. 4], *ardastāna, asman, asti, isu* [WB. *išu*, cf. Justi, ZDMG. L 663 seq.], *upastā, usatašana, √xšnās, gastā, √tars, θastanaiy, dāsyaman* [WB. *dārayątā*; Justi, ZDMG. L 663 seq., *dāsyamā*], *nisāya, √pars, pasā, pasāva, pārsa, pisā, basta, √ras, rāsta, vaumisa, vasiy, saka, skųka, √san* [doubtful; WB. substitute for its occurrences (Bh. iv. 71, 73, 77) *√kan*], *√sar* [Bh. iii. 91. This is the reading of Rawlinson and Spiegel; WB. *ākariyątām*], *sar*[*ā*] [? see Jackson, JAOS. XX 55], *sikayauvati, suguda, sugda, skudra, √star* [?], *√stā, stānam, sparda* [or *saparda*; cf. on this word below].

2. *θ.* *aθągaina, aθiy* [WB. rightly *abiy* in Bh. i. 91], *aθiyābaušana, aθura, amuθa, avaθā, xšāyaθiya, gaiθā, gāθu, θuvam, θaigrači* [so after Justi, ZDMG. LI 242 seq.], *θakatā, θatagu, √θad, √θah, θuxra, θuravāhara, θarda, niyaθārayam, duvarθi, paθi, parθava, maθišta, yaθā, viθ, viθa, viθiya.*

Discussion.—Aside from combinations of consonants, where *s* is invariably written, we have the following classification of the material just collected:

1. a. *s* = Iran. *s* = Indog. *ŝk(h)* in *ayasatā* [see under Bh. i. §12], *√xšnās, √ras*, and according to a verbal suggestion of Prof. Jackson in *sara-* NRa. 52, which he compares with Sk. *chala* (cf. Gk. σκολιός, Lat. *scelus*, and for the phonology Jackson, Av. Gramm. 49; Wackernagel, Altind. Gramm. I 155 seq.). Oppert, JA., 4 sér., XIX 168, suggested *saranā*, but he compared Sk. *śáraṇa* instead of *chalana.* [Professor Jackson's discussion of *sara* has now appeared in JAOS. XX 55.]

b. *s* = Iran. *s* = Indog. *k̂* in *vasiy, asariyatā* [? cf. sup.].

c. *s* = Iran. *s* = Indog. *k̂h* in *√san* [Bartholomae, KZ. XXVII 367; Stud. zur indog. Sprachgeschichte, II 53 seq.].

Digitized by Google

d. *s* = Iran. *sť* in *pasā*, *pasāva* [cf. Bartholomae, Stud. zur indog. Sprachgeschichte, II 50 f.; Hübschmann, Pers. Stud. 209; also below under *sp*].

e. *s* = Iran. *θr* = Indog. *tr* in *vaxmisa* [Hüsing, Die iranischen Eigennamen in den Achämenideninschriften, 13, 15, 18, 33]. Cf. also 'Ασιδάτης for **aθ'i*°, Justi, Iran. Namenb. 43.

f. *s* = Iran. *st* = Indog. *dt* in *usatašana* [WB. *ustašana*].

g. *s* = Iran. *š* in *isu* [WB. *išu*] (compare, however, Justi, ZDMG. L 663 seq.).

h. *s* occurs in the foreign proper names *nisāya* [Median], *saka* [see Müller, WZKM. VII 258], *sikayauvati* [Hüsing, 27, reads *Sikayahvati*], *suguda*, *sugda*, *sparda* [Benfey and Rawlinson understood by this word Sparta; Spiegel, the Sepharad of Obadiah 20, which the Vulgate renders *in Bosphoro*. Lassen, ZKM. VI 50 referred to Σάρδεις <*σκαρδ°. This is well defended by Meyer, IF. I 326–329, who compares also the form Σκάρις of Johann. Lydus, De mens. iii. 14; cf. also Müller, WZKM. II 93 seq., and Nöldeke, ibid. 92. This is the identification which I adopt. Oppert, Le peuple . . . des Mèdes, 164, supposes Sparda to be "Lycie, conservée dans le grec Sarpedon," but Lewy, Semitische Fremdwörter im Griechischen, 193 seq., assigns a Semitic origin to Sarpedon].

i. *s* is of doubtful origin in the word *pisā*, which is of unknown signification (Bh. v. 25).

2. a. *θ* = Iran. *s* = Indog. $\hat{k}$ in *aθqgaina*, *θaigraťi*, *θakatā*, *√θad*, *√θah*, *θuxra*, *θuravāhara*, *θarda*, *maθišta*, *viθ*, *viθiya*.

b. *θ* = Iran. *θ* = Indog. *th* in *amuθa*, *avaθā*, *xšāyaθiya*, *gaiθā*, *gāθu*, *θuvam*, *duvarθi*, *paθi*, *yaθā*.

c. *θ* = Iran. *sr* in *niyaθ'ārayam* [?].

d. *θ* = Iran. *s* in the foreign names *aθiyāθaušana* [Hüsing, 20; Justi, Iranisches Namenbuch, 50], *aθura*, *θatagu*.

e. *θ* = Iran. *θ* in *parθava*.

Results from the Anc. Persian.—Iranian *s* initially is in general represented by *θ*, excepting in the roots *sar* and *san* (both rather doubtful). Again, *s* arising from $\hat{k}$ is retained before *i* only in *vasiy* in contrast with *maθišta* and *viθiya*. But this double rendering of *s* before *i* is in itself a confirmation of our right to assume a like mutual interchange of *s* and *θ* before *a* [against this view Hübschmann, Pers. Stud. 209]. An additional example of

Digitized by Google

s before *a* is *āyasatā*, if Bartholomae's reading [Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 75] be adopted. In the foreign name *θatagu* the single change of initial *s* is also to be remarked.

s arising from *sč*, *dt*, or *š* never interchanges with *θ*.

Material from the New Susian and the Babylonian.—Instructive in this connection is the comparison of Anc. Pers. *θaigračī* = New Sus. *Saikurričīš* with Anc. Pers. *θuxra* = New Sus. *Tukkurra* (but Babylon. *Suḫra*) and Anc. Pers. *θuravāhara* = N. Sus. *Tormar*. The equivalents of Anc. Pers. *θatagu* and *aθura* are, on the other hand, in New Sus. *Sattakuš* and *Aššuran*, and in Babylon. *Sattagušu* and *Aššur*.

(For final results see below.)

B. *z and d.*

Literature.—In addition to the literature cited above, Hüsing, Die iranischen Eigennamen in den Achämenideninschriften, 26, and for the analogous representation in Elean of ϑ = ð by ζ, Meyer, Griechische Grammatik², 269; Meister, Griechische Dialekte, II 52 seq.

Material.—The material given by the inscriptions with regard to *z* and *d* is as follows:

1. z. *auramazdā*, *azdā*, [*iz*]*āva*, [WB. better [*hizuva*]*m*], *uvāra*[*zm*]*i*, *uvārazmiya*, *uzamayā*, *paruzana*, *paruv zana*, *paruvzana*, *vazraka* [or *vazarka*], *vahyazdāta*, *zarąka*, *zazāna*, *zura*, *zurakara*.

2. d. *āθ̌iyādiya*, *ada*, *adakaiy*, *adam*, *adukani*, *apadāna*, *ayādana*, *arakadri*, *artavardiya*, *ardaxčašča* [corrupt form on Art. Vase], *ardastāna*, *ardumani*, *aršādā*, *avadā*, *ahifrastādiy* [loc. sg.; cf. on this word now Bartholomae, IF. IX 257–260], *idā*, *ụpadaraṃa* [so correctly read by Oppert, Le peuple . . . des Mèdes, 121; Hüsing, 14, 38, 43], *uvadaičaya* [Müller, WZKM. VII 256, keeps the old reading *uvadaidaya* and compares Anc. Pers. *didā* and its cognate words], *kąpada*, *gądutava*, *gądāra*, *garmapada*, √*gud*, √*jad*, *jadi*, *taxmaspāda*, *taradraya*, *tigraxauda*, *θarda*, *dauštar*, √*danu*, √*dar*, *draya*, √*darš*, *dasta*, *dašabāri* [? cf. under Bh. i. §18], *dahyu*, √*dā*, *dādarši*, *dāduhya*, *dārayavau*, *dāsyaman* [NRd. WB. *dārątā* (?); Justi, ZDMG. L 658, *dāsyamā*], *-dim*, √*di*, *didā*, *dipi*, *dubāla*, *dura*, √*duruj*,

Digitized by Google

duruva, duvaištam, duvarā, duvarθi, duvilātarnam, duvitiya, dušiyāra, drauga, draujana, drąga [WB. better *dargam*], *nadiṯabira, nabukudračara, nipadiy, paišiyāuvādā, patipadam, √pā, bardiya, bāgayādi, frāda, marduniya, mudrāya, yadā, yadiy, avarada, rādiy, vardana, vidā, vidarna, viḍafrā, viḍafranā, sparda, hadā, hadiš, hąguda, haldita, hiḍu.*

Discussion.—These cases of *z* and *d* fall into the following classifications:

1. a. *z* = Iran. *z* in *auramazdā, azdā,* [*hizuva*]*m* [Spiegel [*iz*]*āva*], *uvāra*[*zm*]*i, uvārazmiya, uzamaya* [*z*+*d* giving *zz*, which is simplified to *z*]. *paruzana, paruv zana, paruvzana, vazraka, vahyazdāta, zazāna, zura, zurakara.*

b. *z* = Iran. *d* in *zarąka.*

2. a. *d* = Iran. *d*(*h*) in *ada, adakaiy, adukani, ardastāna, ardumani, aršādā, avadā, azdā, ahifrastādiy, idā, ụpadaraṃa, uvadaičaya* [cf. above], *kąpada* [Hüsing, 38, *Kampanda*, after the New Sus. *Kampantaš*], *gądutava* [Justi, Grundriss der iran. Phil. II 430, to New Pers. گندم], *gądāra, garmapada, √jad, jadiy, taxmaspāda, tigrahauda, θarda, √danu, √dar, √darš, dahyu, √dā, dādarši, dārayavau, dāsyaman* [see above], *-dim, didiy, dipi, dubāla, duraiy, √duruj, duruva, duvaištam, duvarā, duvarθi, duvilātarnam, duvitiya, dušiyāra, drauga, draujana, dargam, nadiṯibira, nabukudračara, nipadiy, paišiyāuvādā, patipadam, pādiy, frāda, mudrāya, rādiy, vardana, vidarna, viḍafrā, viḍafranā, sparda, hadā, hadiš, hąguda, haldita, hiḍu.*

b. *d* = Iran. *z* in *āθ'iyādiya, adam, ayādana, artavardiya* [Justi, Iran. Namenb. 38], *√gud, taradraya, draya, dasta, adānā, dāduhya* [Babylonian *Zāṯu*], *√di* 'deprive,' *didā* [cf. New Pers. حرز], *bardiya, bāgayādi, marduniya* [cf. Justi, Iran. Namenb. 195], *yadiy, avarada.*

c. *d* is of uncertain origin in *apadāna* [?], *arakadri* [probably for *d*, cf. the New Sus. *Arakkatarriš* and the Babylonian *Arakadri*], *dašabārim* [WB. *ušabārim*; Foy, KZ. XXXV 35 seq., reads *uštrabārim*; cf. below, §18], *yadā* [Bh. iii. 26 to *√yad* = Av. *yaz*; cf. Darmesteter, Étud. Iran. I 45, note. Foy, KZ. XXXV 43, emends *haṯā ya*[*u*]*dāyā frarixta* "vom kriegszug zurückgelassen (d. i. zurückgeblieben)." I myself retain the old reading *yadā*], *vidā* [Bh. iv. 87—unintelligible].

Digitized by Google

Results from the Ancient Persian.—Ancient Persian *z* = Iran. *z* throughout except in *zarąka*, but Iran. *z* is represented more frequently in Anc. Pers. by *d* = *ð* [cf. Hübschmann, Pers. Stud. 198 seq.]. Both *z* and *d* occur alike medially and finally, and no fixed law can be laid down concerning their interchange any more than concerning *s* and *θ*. It is to be noted that in all the modern Iranian dialects except New Persian, Iran. *z* becomes *d* only in loan-words from the Persian, *z* being in all other cases preserved [Hübschmann, Pers. Stud. 221].

Material from the New Susian and the Babylonian.

1. a. Anc. Pers. *d* = Babylon. *z* in Anc. Pers. *Artavardiya* = Babylon. *Artavarziya*; Anc. Pers. *Dāduhya* = Babylon. *Zātu*, but New Sus. *Tattuhiya*; Anc. Pers. *Bardiya* = Babylon. *Barziya*, but New Sus. *Pirtiya*.

b. Anc. Pers. *d* = Babylon. *d* = New Sus. *t* in Anc. Pers. *dipi* = Babylon. *duppu* [a Semitic word] = New Sus. *tuppi*.

c. Anc. Pers. *d* = New Sus. *t* throughout (e. g. Anc. Pers. *Dubāla* = New Sus. *Tupala*, Anc. Pers. *dahyauš* = New Sus. *tayiyauš*), except in the case of *zana*.

2. a. Anc. Pers. *z* = Babylon. *z* = New Sus. *č*(*č*) in Anc. Pers. *Zarąka* = Babylon. *Zarangā* = New Sus. *Čaranka*(*š*), Anc. Pers. *Zazāna* = Babylon. *Zazannu* = New Sus. *Čaččan*.

b. Anc. Pers. *z* = New Sus. *t* only in *zazānam* = New Sus. *tanaš-pe-na*, Xerx. Pers. ca 7, and in the other occurrences of *zana* (Dar. Pers. a 3–4, NRa. 8, Dar. Elv. 14, Xerx. Pers. a 7, ca 7, Van. 12). [Cf. on *zana* now Remy, JAOS. XX 70. The Ancient Persian word has been borrowed in Biblical Aramaic זנא and in Syriac *znā*.]

(For final result see below.)

C. *sp*.

Literature.—Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 29 seq., and the authors there quoted; Hübschmann, Pers. Stud. 178; Foy, KZ. XXXV 19 seq.; Hüsing, Die iranischen Eigennamen in den Achämenideninschriften, 24–26.

Material.—The material given by the inscriptions for the double representation in Anc. Pers. by *sp* and *s* of Iranian *sp* = Indog. *k̂u̯* is as follows:

Digitized by Google

1. sp. *aspačanā, uvaspa, taxmaspāda, vayaspāra, vispazana, vištāspa,* σπακα [Median], Σπιθραδάτης.
2. s. *asagarta, asagartiya, asabāri, visa, visadahyu.*

Discussion.—These cases are sufficiently classified by the presentation of the material.

Results from the Ancient Persian.—The proper names in which *sp* is retained are usually explained as Median. With *visa* is compared Old Slavic *vьsь* and Lithuanian *vìsas*, while *as^{a}b^{a}ari* is a case of haplology [further examples in Brugmann, Vergl. Gramm. I^{2} 858]. Horn's explanation of *asabāri* as from **assa*° [Grundriss der neupers. Etymologie, Nos. 160, 749] is rejected by Hübschmann, Pers. Stud. 77, and by Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 29. Müller's connection, WZKM. VIII 182–183, of *asa* with ὠκύς is wrong. Notwithstanding this, I believe that Horn is right. We find precisely the same development in the Pāli-Prākrit *assa, vissa* for Skt. *aśva, viśva* = Av. *aspa, vispa*. But in Avestan *sp* can hardly become *s* as is suggested by Horn, No. 749, note, and by Hüsing, 25, for *Asabana* of Yašt, v. 73; xiii. 140 [the correct view is given by Justi, Iran. Namenb. 42].

Material from the New Susian and the Babylonian.

1. a. Anc. Pers. *sp* = New Sus. *šp* = Babylon. *sp* in Anc. Pers. *Aspačīna* = New Sus. *Ašpačana* = Babylon. *Aspašina*; Anc. Pers. *Taxmaspāda* = New Sus. *Takmašpata*; Anc. Pers. *Vayaspāra* = New Sus. *Mišparra* = Babylon. *Visparā*; Anc. Pers. *Vispauzatiš* = New Sus. *Mišpaučatiš*; Anc. Pers. *Vištāspa* = New Sus. *Mištašpa* = Babylon. *Vistaspi*; Anc. Pers. *vispazana* = New Sus. *mišpazanaš* (Dar. Pers. a 3, where only the New Sus. text has this addition: 'of all nations').

b. Anc. Pers. *sp* = New Sus. *šš* in Anc. Pers. *vispazana* = New Sus. *mišša*tanaš* (NRa. 8).

2. a. Anc. Pers. *s* < Iran. *sp* = New Sus. *šš* (= Babylon. *sk*!) in Anc. Pers. *Asagartiya* = New Sus. *Aššakartiya* (= Babylon. *Iskartai*); Anc. Pers. *visadahyuš* = New Sus. *mišša*tayihuš* (Xerx. Pers. a 11 f.).

(For final result see below.)

Digitized by Google

D. *Final Result.*

The confusion in Ancient Persian in the use of *s* and *θ*, and of *z* and *d*, is explained by Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 166, as due to dialect-mixture, and this theory has been carried still further by Hüsing (15, 23 seq.) on the basis of the representation by New Sus. *š*(*š*) of Anc. Pers. *θ*, *θr*, *t*(*a*)*r*, and *s*, and again by the New Sus. transcription with *t*+vowel+*r* of Anc. Pers. *θr* and *t*(*a*)*r*. The explanation by dialect-mixture is fatally easy, but the promiscuous use of forms of different dialects is hardly to be expected in an official language, such as that which is being considered—proper names, of course, excepted.

Conclusion.—Our conclusion, at least temporarily, is as follows:

For **A, B.** At a very early period in Persia, before the time of Darius, there had begun the process which resulted in the phonetic equivalence of *s* and *θ*, and similarly of *z* and *ð* (*d* in script) [similarly to be explained is the interchange of *s* and *θ* in Avesta and of such cases as the Av. *yezi* beside *yeθi*].[1] The consequence of this equivalence of sound, combined with a lack of etymological feeling, was the confusion of usage of the characters for *s* and *θ*, and for *z* and *d*, which we have observed.

For **C.** Simultaneously with the phenomena just discussed, there was in process of development another *s*, which arose from the assimilation of two juxtaposed consonants. Three such combinations will engage our attention here. One was, if our course of argument has been correct, *sp* which became *ss*, and is consequently written *s*. The second assimilation was that of Aryan *tr* which developed through the intermediate stage of Iran. *θr* to *s* in "the dialect with which the Elamites had most to do" [Hüsing, 15, 18].

The third assimilation is in *pasā*, *pasāva* from **pasča* (Av. *pasča*, *paskāṯ*; Sk. *paścā*, *paścāt*; Lithuan. *pāskui*) through the same medial stage *ss* [Bartholomae, Stud. zur indog. Sprachgeschichte, II 50–51, does not favor this. Against his view see Foy, KZ. XXXV 22, 26, who also compares Sk. *acchā* from **at*

[1] As a similar phonetic development in an entirely different group of languages, I may cite the modern Persian and Egyptian pronunciation of the Arabic *ṯ* (þ) and *ḏ* (ð) as *s* and *z* respectively. As Avestan examples of an interchange between *s* and *θ* in late texts, I note from the variae lectiones of Vend. xix. *jasāhi* (§18) **Jp** 1, *s* also in **Mf** 2, **L** 1. 2. **Br** 1. **K** 10. **M** 2, but *jaθāi* **L** 4. **K** 1; *fraθō* (§19) beside *frasō* **K** 1. **L** 4; *pairiθnəm* (§28) **Jp** 1. **Mf** 2. **L** 1. 2, *pairisinəm* **K** 1, *pairišnəm* **L** 4. Numerous other cases might be given.

Digitized by Google

(cf. Lat. *ad*) + *cha*].[1] The only other combination of *s* + *č* in Anc. Pers. is *kaščiy*, where the feeling for the enclitic *-čiy* has prevented any assimilation (so also in the case of *š* < *ť* in *avaščiy*, *čišciy*, etc.).

This *s* arising from assimilation is never confused with Iran. *s* = Indog. *k̄*. In other words, it never approached the phonetic value *þ*.

We have sought to show that there is no law which determines when we shall find *s* and when *θ*, when *z* and when *d*, and also that this absence of rule is not due to any dialect-mixture or similar cause. There remains the explanation which we have endeavored to uphold: the phonetic equivalence and consequent confusion of usage of *s* and *θ*, and of *z* and *d*. Attention has also been drawn to precisely similar phenomena presented by the Lakonic and Elean dialects of the Greek. Lastly, the degeneration of the old Iranian *s* toward the value *þ* receives an additional confirmation, when we note the sharp distinction in the case of *s* arising from assimilation which nowhere in the inscriptions interchanges with *θ*. Hübschmann, Pers. Stud. 115, has called attention to the fact that of all the Iranian dialects only the Ancient Persian, with its successors the Middle and New Persian, shows this confusion in the usage of *s* and *θ*, of *z* and *d*.

[While the final proof of this paper is still in my hands, the valuable studies of Dr. Hüsing, 'Altiranische Mundarten, I' and 'Zur persischen Lautlehre,' KZ. XXXVI 556–571, have appeared. Despite the arguments by which he seeks to prove the existence of the six Ancient Iranian vernaculars which he calls the *missa-*, *mitara*, *miθ̊a-* [these three in the Anc. Pers. inscriptions in his view], *miθra-* [Avesta according to him], *mitr-*, and *mihr(a)*-dialects, I am unable as yet to find myself converted to his theory. His method of operating almost exclusively with proper names is not perhaps altogether invulnerable. I am, moreover, well aware of the fact that where the Anc., Middle, and Mod. Pers. have *d*, but the Avesta has *z*, the Afγān, Balūcī, Kurdish, Ossetish, and Persian dialects have *z* likewise [see now Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 2, 82–83, 90–91, 205, 209, 236, 258–259, 305, 352, 385, 414, and with regard to the problem of *s* and *θ*, ibid. 85–86, 93–94, 305, 352, 385]. I am still unwilling, notwithstanding this, to see in the official inscriptions of the Ancient Persian kings "eine

[1] In favor of the view here sustained I may now cite Bangalī *pāsā* 'after' beside *pāchā* from Skt. *paścā*. Grierson, ZDMG. L 25; cf. Bhandarkar, J. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc. XVII 2, 173.

Digitized by Google

mischsprache aus zwei verschiedenen mundarten" (Hüsing, 562). I still hold to the explanation which I have suggested above for the varying usage in Anc. Pers. of *s* beside *θ*, and of *z* beside *d*—namely, to the hypothesis that these sounds *s* and *θ*, *z* and *d* had become in the Anc. Pers. phonetically equivalent.]

INFLECTION.

Nominative Singular of -as-Stems.

Literature.—Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 214 seq.

The solution of the Ancient Persian phrases such as xiv. *raučabiš θakatā āha* has been often tried. The word *θakatā* is generally considered now as the loc. sg. of an *-i*-stem [Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 227], but the old view that *raučabiš* is an instr. with comitative force is still held by Bartholomae, op. cit. 246, "Mit dem 14. Tage im Vjachna-Monat, in [dessen] Verlauf war es, als er sich auflehnte" (similarly Foy, KZ. XXXV 33, 68). To Prof. Jackson I owe the suggestion that *raučabiš* is the inst. pl. used as a general plural case, exactly as in Avestan [Jackson, Av. Gramm. 67; Schmidt, Pluralbildungen, 98 seqq., 259 seqq.; cf. also Bartholomae, Arische Forschungen, II 104. Foy's arguments, KZ. XXXIII 426–430, against any general plural case fail to convince me]. This would give the rendering: 'xiv days were in course.' On my attempt to explain similarly the difficult *viθibiš*, see under Bh. i. §14 [against this explanation both of *raučabiš* and *viθibiš*, Schmidt, Pluralb. 266 seq.].

This view of *raučabiš* leads of itself to a consideration of the similar phrase in Bh. iii. 8: *garmapadahya māhyā* i. *rauča θakatā āha* 'Of the month Garmapada one day was in course.' Here *rauča* is not an accusative, as Spiegel, Keilinschr.[2] 238, and Hübschmann, Casuslehre, 293, say, but the nom. sg. as subject of *āha*.

Another nominative of the *-as*-stems is found in Sz. c 9: *haťā pirāva nāma rauta ɨya mudrāyaiy danauvatiy* [Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 195, reads *danautiy*, *danutaiy*, or *danuvatiy* for this last word] 'From a river, Nile by name, which flows in Egypt.' Bang, ZDMG. XLIII 534, makes *rauta* the accusative after *haťā*, and he compares Bh. i. 50–51: *karāšim haťā daršam atarsa* 'The people were mightily afraid of him.' The explanation of Thumb, KZ. XXXII 129, by an anakoluthon

Digitized by Google

fails to observe the idiom of the language, and Foy's "compound," KZ. XXXV 32, is rather more artificial than necessary. The reading of Müller, WZKM. I 224, *haćā pirāva* [ablative = Av. **piraōṭ*] *nāma rautata*, need not be dwelt upon. The true explanation is that of Bartholomae, BB. XIV 249, who makes *rauta* the nominative and compares for the construction Bh. iii. 12–14: *pasāva adam frāišayam dādaršiš nāma pārsa mana bąḍaka baxtariyā xšaθapāvā* 'Afterward I sent a Persian, Dādarši by name, my servant, satrap in Bactria,' also Bh. i. 36–37: *haćā paišiy[yā]uvādāyā arakadriš nāma kaufa* 'From a hill, Arakadri by name, in Paišiyāuvāda' [cf. Hübschmann, Casusl. 289 seq.]. In the light of this Bartholomae's omission of any nom. sg. of the *-as*-stems in the Grundriss der iran. Philol. must be an oversight.

TRANSLATION.

Behistān, i.

§1, *lines 1–3.* I am Darius, the great king, king of kings, king in Persia, king of lands, son of Hystaspes, grandson of Arsames, an Achaemenian.

§2, *lines 3–6.* Saith Darius the king: My father [was] Hystaspes. The father of Hystaspes [was] Arsames. The father of Arsames was Ariaramnes. The father of Ariaramnes [was] [Teïspes]. The father of Teïspes was Achaemenes.

§3, *lines 6–8.* Saith Darius the king: Therefore we are called Achaemenians. From aforetime we have been tested. From aforetime our house hath been kings.

§4, *lines 8–11.* Saith Darius the king: Eight of my house, they were kings before. I am the ninth. Nine from days of old we are kings.

§5, *lines 11–12.* Saith Darius the king: By the grace of Ormazd I am king. Ormazd brought unto me the kingdom.

§6, *lines 12–17.* Saith Darius the king: These lands, they came unto me. By the grace of Ormazd I am their king: Persia, Susiana, Babylon, Assyria, Arabia, Egypt, those of the sea, Sparda [Sardis?], Ionia, Media, Armenia, Cappadocia, Parthia, Drangiana, Aria, Chorasmia, Bactria, Sogdiana, Gandara [Kandahar? Oppert], Scythia, Sattygia, Arachosia, Maka [Mekran?] —altogether twenty-three lands.

Digitized by Google

§7, *lines 17–20.* Saith Darius the king: These lands, they came unto me. By the grace of Ormazd they were my subjects. They brought me tribute. What was said unto them by me either by night or day, that they did.

§8, *lines 20–24.* Saith Darius the king: Within these lands the man who was a friend, I treated him well. Who was a foe, I administered a good inquisition to him. By the grace of Ormazd these lands obeyed what [were] my laws. As it was proclaimed by me unto them, so they did.

tyanā: Benfey, Pers. Keilinschr. 9; Bartholomae, Stud. zur indog. Sprachgeschichte, II 70; and Foy, KZ. XXXV 45, Anm., think that it has received its *-nā* from the following *manā* by dittography, but this fails to explain fully the *-ă-*. The majority, as Oppert, JA., 4. sér., XVII 287; Hübschmann, Casusl. 298; Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 236 (hesitatingly); and Brugmann, Vergl. Gramm. II 782, regard this word as an instr. (cf. Av. *ka-na* beside *kā*, Skt. *kē-na*, *tē-na*, *ē-na*). Kern, ZDMG. XXIII 227 seq., made it an abl. Müller's attempt in WZKM. VII 112 to explain the *-n-* as for an *-hm-* arising from *-sm-* fails to convince me (cf. Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 166, 169, 237). I must give my adherence to the rendering of Bartholomae, Stud. zur indog. Sprachgeschichte, II 70: "diese länder, was meine gesetze sind, die ehrten sie" (for similar cases of *tya* standing alone as a compound relative see Bh. iv. 42, 49, 53; Xerx. Pers. b 30, da [db] 19, Art. a 35; cf. also Xerx. Pers. a 19–20, ca [cb] 13–14). This rendering agrees very closely with the Babylonian text (the New Susian version here is lost), *dênâtu attûà ina birît mâtâti agânêtu ušazkû* (?) 'these laws were fulfilled (?) within these lands (cf. Bezold's text and translation). My only suggestion is to regard the *n* in *tyanā* not as a dittography, but as an analogical formation after the instrumental. Other instances of a similar insertion of *n* through false analogy are not lacking in Iranian pronouns. An Avestan case in point is *činəm* beside the regular *kəm*, *čîm* 'whom?' and for the Old Persian we may cite the troublesome *yanaiy* C 22 (Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 236–237). Müller's explanation of *yanaiy*, WZKM. XII 76–77, is unsatisfactory. The third instance of the analogical use of *n* is in the word *aniyanā*, Dar. Pers. d 11, e 20. This is, as Spiegel (and Foy, KZ. XXXV 10; 52) have rightly seen, an ablative which has fallen together in form with

Digitized by Google

the instrumental on account of the loss of the final *-t*. These parallel cases, *činəm*, *yanaiy*, and *aniyanā* would seem to favor my view that *tyanā* also is an instance of false analogy after the instrumental singular rather than a dittography arising from the final *-nā* of the following word *manā*.

§9, *lines 24–26*. Saith Darius the king: Ormazd brought unto me the kingdom. Ormazd brought me help until this kingdom was held. By the grace of Ormazd I hold this kingdom.

§10, *lines 26–35*. Saith Darius the king: This [is] what was done by me after that I became king. One Cambyses by name, the son of Cyrus, of our house, was king here before. Of that Cambyses there was a brother, Bardiya by name, having the same mother and the same father as Cambyses. Afterward Cambyses killed that Bardiya. When Cambyses killed Bardiya, the people had no knowledge that Bardiya was killed. Afterward Cambyses went to Egypt. When Cambyses went to Egypt, then the people became hostile. Then the Lie waxed at will in the land, both in Persia, and in Media, and in the other lands.

azdā: Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 143 (cf. now IF. IX 279–281), considers *azdā* to be the locative singular of an *i*-stem used adverbially (on the syntax cf. Delbrück, Altind. Synt. 202 seq.). Johansson, IF. II 28, with whom I agree, regards Anc. Pers. *azdā* as a noun in the nom.

avajata: For my reading, with correction of the stone, of *avājata* (i. e. $\sqrt{jan}+ava+ā$ as in all other cases of *avāj°*) see Rawlinson's lithograph of Bh. i. 32: *av*^{a} *j*^{a}*t*^{a}. This gap I would fill with *a*.

§11, *lines 35–43*. Saith Darius the king: Afterward there was a man, a Magian, Gaumāta by name. He arose from a hill, Arakadri by name, in Paišiyauvādā, [yea, even] from there. Of the month Viyaxna fourteen days were in course when he arose. He thus lied unto the people: I am Bardiya, the son of Cyrus, the brother of Cambyses. Afterward the people all became confederate from Cambyses. They went over to that man, both Persia, and Media, and the other lands. He seized the kingdom. Of the month Garmapada nine days were in course. Then he seized the kingdom. Afterward Cambyses died by his own hand.

māhyā: Bartholomae, BB. IX 309 seq., Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 215; Horn, 'Grundriss der neupers. Etymologie,' No. 968; Foy, KZ. XXXV 5, take this as the loc. sg. of *māh* [Av.

Digitized by Google

māh, Skt. *mās*] +*ā*. It is, however, far better to return to the old view and to consider *māhyā* as standing for the genitive *māhahya* from *māha* [Av. *mąṇha*, Skt. *māsa*]. The material offered by the inscriptions for the retention or omission of *h* = Indog. *s* in the Anc. Pers. combination *-ăhă-* is as follows [for Avesta examples see Jackson, Av. Gramm. 102, 131, 148, 154]:

1. *h* is retained: *auramazdāhă, anahata, āvahanam, ahatiy, āham, āha, āhątā, parikarāhadiš* [WB. *parikarāh*[*i*]*diš*], *xšnās*-[*āhadiš*], *aθaham, aθaha, θuravāhara, nāha, fraharva, bagāha, patiyāvahaiy, vahauka, visanāhadiš* [WB. *vikanāh*[*i*]*diš*], *frāhąjam*.

2. *h* is omitted: *θāhy, θātiy, āpariyāya* [if it is to be connected with Skt. √*sap*, Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 85, 196; Stud. zur indog. Sprachgeschichte, II 70], *vivāna* [cf. Av. *vivaṇhā* and see Justi, Iran. Namenb. 374].

If *māhyā* were a locative, *Viyaxnahya* could only be an "appositional genitive," an explanation which does not appeal to me here. On the construction of *raučabiš* see above under the 'Nominative Singular of *-as*-Stems.'

§12, *lines 43–48*. Saith Darius the king: This kingdom of which Gaumāta the Magian deprived Cambyses, this kingdom from aforetime belonged to our house. Afterward Gaumāta the Magian deprived Cambyses both of Persia, and of Media, and of the other lands. He assumed [it = the kingdom (?) and] made [it] under his own dominion. He became king.

ayastā: Notwithstanding the criticisms of Foy, KZ. XXXV 33 seq., I have made the above rendering in full accord with Bartholomae, BB. XIV 246 seq. [cf. the same scholar, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 75], who compares for the single object of two verbs the following three passages: **a.** Bh. ii. 87–88: *kā*[*ra*] *hya manā . . . čiθątaxmam agarbāya anaya abiy mām* 'My army . . . seized, brought unto me Čiθantaxma.' **b.** Bh. iv. 42–43: *tya manā kartam varnavatām θuvām māt*[*ya duruxtam man*]*iyāhy* 'Let my deed [*or* what hath been done of me] seem true to thee, deem it not false' (*kartam* being the subject of *varnavatām* and the object of *man*]*iyāhy*). **c.** Bh. iv. 70–72: [*tu*]*vam kā hya aparam imām dipim vaināhy tyām adam niyapišam imaivā patikarā mātya vikanāhy yāvā ji*[*vāhy*] 'O thou who in time to come shalt behold this tablet which I have cut or these pictures, destroy [them] not so long as thou livest.' Foy's objections certainly fail in the case of **a**, even if we grant them in **b** and **c**.

Digitized by Google

Kern, ZDMG. XXIII 229 seq., and formerly Bartholomae, Handbuch, 209, regarded *ayastā* as the nom. of a noun in *-ar* governing the acc. as does *kāma* in Bh. iv. 35 and NRa. 38. Benfey, Pers. Keilinschr. 18, compared Sk. *āyatta* 'dependent upon' [similarly Hoffmann, BB. XVIII 285 seq., who construed *ayastā* as the instr. sg.]. The use of *āyasatā* [so to be read with Bartholomae instead of *ayastā*] is similar in Bh. iii. 4, 42. Perhaps one may compare also the asyndeton in such passages as Bh. iv. 57–58: *yadiy imām haṛdugām apagaudayāhy naiy θāh[y kārahyā Auramaz]dātay jatā biyā* 'if thou shalt conceal this inscription, not speak unto the people, may Ormazd slay thee.' It is also noteworthy that the New Susian renders *āyasatā* by the verb *emituš*, which is the regular translation of the Anc. Pers. root *di* 'deprive.' The Anc. Pers. *uvāipašiyam akutā* appears in New Susian as *tuman-e* 'zum Besitztum'; cf. Foy, ZDMG. LII 570, 564.

§13, *lines 48–61.* Saith Darius the king: There was not a man, either a Persian, or a Median, or any of our house, who would make Gaumāta the Magian deprived of his kingdom. The people were mightily afraid of him. "He would be killing at will the people that had known the former Bardiya." For this reason he would be killing the people: "That they may not know that I am not Bardiya, the son of Cyrus." No one dared to say aught concerning Gaumāta the Magian until I came. Afterward I implored Ormazd. Ormazd brought me help. Ten days of the month Bāgayādi were in course. Then I with a few men killed that Gaumāta the Magian and those men who were his foremost followers in a stronghold Sikayauvati by name in a land Nisaia by name in Media. There I killed him. I deprived him of the kingdom. By the grace of Ormazd I became king. Ormazd brought unto me the kingdom.

avājaniyā: An iterative optative from *√jan+ava+ā* [cf. Stackelberg, Beiträge zur Syntax des Ossetischen, 77]. For similar phenomena in Avestan see Bartholomae, Altiran. Verb. 212, 216; KZ. XXVIII 37; Stud. zur indog. Sprachgeschichte, II 127; Jackson, PAOS. XVII clxxxvii; and cf. Delbrück, Vergl. Synt. II 372 seq. The idea of Spiegel, Vergl. Gramm. 344, and of Foy, KZ. XXXV 34, that this word is an augmented optative, I can not accept.

§14, *lines 61–71.* Saith Darius the king: The kingdom that had been taken away from our house, that I established. I set it

Digitized by Google

in its place. As before, so I made the places of worship which Gaumāta the Magian had digged down. I restored to the people the servants (?), and the live-stock (?), and the real estate, and the private property (?) of which Gaumāta the Magian had deprived them. I set the people in their place, both Persia, and Media, and the other lands. As before, so I brought back what had been taken away. By the grace of Ormazd I did this. I toiled until I set our family in its place as before. So I toiled by the grace of Ormazd that Gaumāta the Magian did not take away our family.

niyaθārayam: The Av. √*srār*+*ni* of Vd. xviii. 51: *imәm mē narәm nisrārayå* 'This man shalt thou restore to me' [similarly already Justi, Handb. der Zendspr. 307; cf. also Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 71]. Brugmann, Vergl. Gramm. I² 856 seq., connects this √*srār* with the Av. *nis'rinaoʻti* [see among other passages again Vd. xviii. 51, and cf. Sk. √*śri*, Gk. κλίνω, etc.], and he thus supposes a progressive disappearance of the spirant.

abicariš: The reading *abācariš* is adopted by Spiegel. This has been best defended by Darmesteter, Étud. Iran. II 129–131, who connects *abācariš* with the Sk. *sabhā* and the √*car*, its modern representative being the New Pers. بازار. Darmesteter's view is refuted by Horn, Grundriss der neupers. Etymologie, No. 166, because of the Pahl. *vačār* 'bazaar' [cf. also Hübschmann, Pers. Stud. 23]. Bartholomae's suggestion [apud Horn, loc. cit., and Grundriss der iran. Philol. II 149], *qbācariš*, *abaʻāčariš* 'aqueducts,' is not to be adopted on account of the sense. The same criticism must be made of the derivation by Müller, WZKM. IV 108, from **ăp-ācari*. Spiegel's translation 'Weideplätze' implies a connection with New Pers. چریدن 'to pasture' [see Horn, Grundriss der neupers. Etymologie, No. 439]. He is followed by Rugarli, who renders *abicariš gaiθāmčā māniyamčā viθibišča* by 'i pascoli, le campagne, le case, i vici.' The better reading *abičariš* is Rawlinson's, who is followed by WB.

The word *abičariš* also has been explained in several ways. Oppert, JA., 4. sér., XVII 404, 410, renders it 'en sauveur' [cf. the same scholar, Le peuple . . . des Mèdes, 167]. Bang, ZDMG. XLIII 527 seq., and IF. VIII 294, translates 'Hülfsmittel [zum Unterhalt].' This appeals to me no more than Foy's connection with √*bhā* 'shine' [ZDMG. L 132]. Both Rawlinson and Kern,

Digitized by Google

ZDMG. XXIII 235, appear to me to have come nearest the solution. For we must compare the Sk. *abhicara* 'servant, attendant,' and we must see in the word a neuter abstract of the *-iš*-stems like *hadiš* [Xerx. Pers. da [db] 16, Xerx. Pers. ca [cb] 11]. On this formation, which is especially close to and often interchanges with that in *-as*, see Brugmann, Vergl. Gramm. II 398 seq.; for the Indo-Iranian, Schmidt, Pluralb. 378–387; for the Iranian, Spiegel, Vergl. Gramm. 175; Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 95–96; for the Avestan, Justi, Handb. der Zendspr. 370; Jackson, Av. Gramm. 102–103; for the Ancient Persian, Spiegel, Keilinschr.[2] 169; for the Sanskrit, Lindner, Altind. Nominalb. 60. Compare also the analogous use of Lat. *seruitium* = *seruos*, e. g. Tac. Ann. xii. 17: *seruitii decem milia offerebant*; Vell. Paterculus, ii. 82, 3: *calonum seruitiique desiderata tertia* [*pars*] *est*; and see Schmidt, Pluralb. 12–20.

Tolman's translation, Transact. Wisconsin Acad. VIII 244, by 'commerce' is not altogether bad. Foy, KZ. XXXV 35, is right in saying that the absence of *-čā* after *abičariš* does not militate against a syntactic equality with the following words. I must therefore differ for the present from Bang, Mélanges Charles de Harlez, 10.

māniyam: At first I connected this word, as does Foy, KZ. XXXV 73, with the √*man*, Gk. μίνω, etc., but I now prefer the older and better comparison with YAv. *nmāna*, GAv. *d'māna*, Gk. δέμω, etc. Bang's connection of Anc. Pers. *māniya* [ZDMG. XLIII 528] with Lat. *mānus*, √*mā* is less happy, and has been withdrawn by him [cf. Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 183]. Neither can I accept Oppert's translation [Le peuple ... des Mèdes, 119]: "Et je restituai, en faveur du peuple, et la croyance et la langue, et je rendis aux familles ce que Gomatès le Mage leur avait enlevé." Darmesteter, Étud. Iran. II 129–131, has compared with the *gaiθā* and *māniya* here the Avestan *gaēθa* and *vīs*. His rendering of the crux is: "(je rendis aussi) les marchés, les fermes et les maisons aux clans."

viθibišča: The old rendering (e. g. in Spiegel, and retained by Schmidt, Pluralb. 266 seq., and by Justi, Grundriss der iran. Philol. II 426 seq.) 'according to clans' is not to be received, as Kern, ZDMG. XXIII 235, already saw. Little better is WB.'s 'in den Häusern (?).' Foy previously, in KZ. XXXIII 424–432, took *viθibiš* as a sociative inst. pl. m. 'with his clanmates.' His parallels were Bh. iv. 73–74 and Xerx. Pers. a 15, but the *-čā*

Digitized by Google

which he accepted [page 420] is against such an interpretation. Foy's later interpretation [ZDMG. L 134 seq.] as *viθbaiša* [cf. Rawlinson, JRAS., O. S. X xviii, on the doubtful reading of the ˀ] from *vi+baiša*^{h}, with a comparison of Av. *vīθbaēšå*, Ved. *vidvēšās*, to which he gives the meaning 'peace,' is well worthy of consideration, though a trifle abstract. Bartholomae, AF. II 104, struck the right note when he assumed that the word is used as the acc. pl. [Less good is his rendering, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 226, as an adverb, 'und überhaupt,' thus making it from *viθa* = Sk. *viśvá* (?).] My own explanation, at least temporarily, is that *viθibišča* is an inst. neut. pl. used as an accus. [cf. on *raučabiš* above under Inflection], and that it comes from a neut. sg. **viθin-*. If this be right, we are to compare for the meaning the gloss of Hesychios οἰκεία· ἰδία, and we see a climax of rapacity at the expense of the Persians, while indulgences were lavished on the other parts of the empire. From the Persians were snatched first the slaves, which could be most easily seized, and last of all even their personal effects. This may throw light on the words of Herodotos, iii. 67: ἀπεδέξατο ἐς τοὺς ὑπηκόους πάντας εὐεργεσίας μεγάλας, ὥστε ἀποθανόντος αὐτοῦ πόθον ἔχειν πάντας τοὺς ἐν τῇ Ἀσίῃ παρὲξ αὐτῶν Περσέων [cf. Spiegel, Keilinschr.^{2} 88–89].

parābara: Since we have the indicative, an *actual* result is stated, as was rightly seen by Foy, KZ. XXXIII 423 seq., and Müller, WZKM. III 147, as against Kern, Spiegel, and WB. Oppert's rendering, JA., 4. sér., XVII 404, is right as regards the indicative, but he errs, in my judgment, in not making *yaθā* the relative of *avaθā*. He thus translates: "Je l'ai arrangé par la volonté d'Ormazd comme ç'avait été avant moi, lorsque Gaumatès le Mage n'avait pas usurpé (notre palais) notre pays."

[Since these lines were first written an able article by Justi has appeared, ZDMG. LIII 89–92, in answer to Foy's criticism, ibid. LII 592, of his rendering of this difficult §14 in the Grundriss der iran. Philol. II 426–427. Professor Justi reads *abāčariš* (Skt. *sabhācará*), which he renders by 'des Volkes Versammlung.' He further regards *gaiθā* as referring to 'the possessions of the nobility,' while *viθibiš* seems to have a dativa l force. It is especially pleasing to see that he too considers *abāčariš gaiθāmčā māniyamčā* as collective singulars. This last word he compares with the Greek οἰκεῖος in the sense of οἰκέτης, οἰκεύς, as I had already sought to trace an analogous development of meaning between *viθibiš* and οἰκεία· ἰδία.]

Digitized by Google

§15, *lines 71–72.* Saith Darius the king: This [is] what I did after that I became king.

§16, *lines 72–81.* Saith Darius the king: When I killed Gaumāta the Magian, afterward a man, Āθ'ina by name, the son of Umpadaranma, he arose in Susiana. To the people he said thus: I am king in Susiana. Afterward Susiana became confederate. It went over to that Āθ'ina. He became king in Susiana. And a man, a Babylonian, Nidintubel by name, the son of Aniri, he arose at Babylon. The people he deceived thus: I am Nebuchadrezzar, the son of Nabûnâ'id. Afterward the Babylonian people all went over to that Nidintubel. Babylon became confederate. He seized the kingdom in Babylon.

§17, *lines 81–83.* Saith Darius the king: Afterward I went to Susiana. That Āθ'ina was brought bound unto me. I killed him.

§18, *lines 83–90.* Saith Darius the king: Afterward I went to Babylon against that Nidintubel, who called himself Nebuchadrezzar. The army of Nidintubel held the Tigris. There it stood and hardby (?) was a fleet (?). Afterward I divided the army in two halves (?). The one I made archers (?), for the other I provided horses. Ormazd brought me help. By the grace of Ormazd we crossed the Tigris. Afterward there I killed at will the army of Nidintubel. Of the month Āθ'iyādiya twenty-six days were in course. Then we made battle.

abiš: For this word I can offer no better explanation than to consider it an adverb [so already Kern, ZDMG. XXIII 237]. For the *-š* we must compare Anc. Pers. *patiy* with *patiš*, Sk. *mithū* with *mithus*, Gk. ἀμφί with ἀμφίς, ἀντικρύ with ἀντικρύς [for further examples see Schmidt, Pluralb. 359 seq., and cf. Bartholomae, Stud. zur indog. Sprachgeschichte, I 75 seq.].

nāviyā: The sense forbids us to consider this the loc. sg. +*ā*. Kern's abstract formation to *nāv* is perhaps the best view. Müller, WZKM. XI 252, makes precisely the same explanation, which is far better than his former rendering, WZKM. I 221, 'und dabei waren Schiffe' [cf. Bartholomae, BB. XIV 242, and Foy, KZ. XXXV 35].

madyakāuvā avākanam: So WB. Spiegel, *-makāuvā avākanam.* Rawlinson, *-m . . (?) káuwá aw . . . . (?) kanam* [cf. his 'Notes on the Text,' xliv seq.]. Oppert, Le peuple . . . des Mèdes, 169, *kamakāuvā* 'portiunculas.' Kern, *amakāuvā.* He

Digitized by Google

compares the Gk. *ἀμίς* (which usually signifies *matella*), and refers for the meaning to Aischylos, Supplices 811:

σοῦσθε, σοῦσθ' ὀλύμεναι ὀλόμεν' ἑπαμίδα.

Müller, WZKM. I 220, reads (*da*)*makāuvā avākanam*, but his translation 'Erdhäuschen' [√*dam* 'build'] is rather strained. Later, WZKM. XI 252, Müller proposes *ramakāuvā* 'in troops' and compares Pahl. *ramak*, New Pers. رمک. This is very good. Foy suggests *ardakāuvā avākarnam*. The only clue to the meaning that we have is the following *aniyam . . . aniyahyā*. I follow Foy in comparing with *arda-* the Ossetic *ardäg*, *ärdäg* 'half,' Sk. *ardhaka* [Apte, Sk.-Eng. Dict. 169; cf. Böhtlingk-Roth, VII, Sp. 1703], Av. *ar*ᵊδa*, but his *avakarnam*<**avakr̥n'nam* is a little dubious, in spite of the weighty authority of Bartholomae, Grundriss der iran. Philol. I 74. The copy of Rawlinson shows that eleven letters are damaged in this place between *kāram* and *-nam*. If we read *ardakaya*, loc. du. (cf. Av. forms like *zastayō*), and take the simple verb of Foy's *avākarnam*, we fill the gap exactly, having in *ardakaya akarnam* ten letters plus one space for the wedge of separation. Foy's explanation of *ardakāuvā*, KZ. XXXV 35, is not altogether convincing to me.

ušabārim: WB. Spiegel reads *dašabārim*, after Rawlinson and Benfey. Oppert, Le peuple . . . des Mèdes, 169, preferred *usabārim . . . açam*. For numerous older interpretations and views see Spiegel, Keilinschr.² 92–93. Müller had two suggestions. The first, WZKM. I 220, was a comparison of Xenophon's Anabasis and the reading of *ašabārim*, where *aša* was to correspond to the Greek *ἀσκός*. Later, WZKM. XI 252 seq., Müller changed his reading to *maišabārim*, and he compared Skt. *mēṣa*, Lith. *maišas*, Old Church Slav. *mĕχъ* 'hide.' Tolman, Transact. Wisconsin Acad. VIII 244, returns to the old reading *daša*° and renders: 'One (army) I made submissive' (i. e. bearing my right hand). Rugarli does not attempt to translate the crux.

My own suggestion is to read for the (*u*)*ša-bārim* of WB. and Rawlinson's *daša-barim išu-bārim*. This I would render: 'one part I made archers' (cf. Skt. *iṣubhṛt*, which has this same signification). A division of the army into archers and cavalry would be very natural, especially in view of the importance of the former arm of the service (cf. Jackson, Herodotus, vii. 61, or Ancient Persian Armour, in Classical Studies in Honour of Henry Drisler, particularly 100, 111–114). The objection may

Digitized by Google

be alleged that the *u* in *išu°* is not found in the text. If, however, my reading *avājata* in §10 be accepted, a parallel instance of the complete omission of a letter is at hand.

A purely etymological reading *iša-bārim* would do no violence to the text. This might be rendered 'borne by swift (chariots),' which would give tolerable sense. For the semasiology of **iša* 'chariot' from √*iš* 'to hasten' one might compare Latin *currus* from *curro*, and for the passive sense of *bāri* the Ancient Persian *asabāri* 'horse-borne, knight.' This suggestion of *išabāri* I regard as much inferior to that of *išubāri*.[1]

[Prof. Jackson suggests that WB.'s reading *uša-bārim* should be retained. He would render the word 'borne by oxen,' with a comparison of Skt. *ukṣan*, Av. *uxšan*. For this instance of Anc. Pers. *š* = Indog. *ks* we may perhaps compare Anc. Pers. *ustašana* (Art. Pers. a 29) beside *hamataxšaiy*, Bh. i. 68, 70, and *hamataxšatā*, Bh. iv. 65, 82. For the passive sense of *-bāri*, Anc. Pers. *asabāri* is to be compared. I have regarded Darius as lining up his forces for battle in this paragraph of the inscription, while Prof. Jackson thinks that the king is furnishing transportation across the Tigris for his troops. Prof. Jackson makes this suggestion with some hesitation, being fully aware of objections which he thinks may be alleged against it; but it has, in my judgment, much in its favor.]

as[*pā*]: WB. This seems to me to be the only tenable reading. Müller's reading, WZKM. I 222, XI 253, *tašma*(*kam*) *anayam* 'Flossbrücke,' from the root *taxš*, is fatally deficient as regards phonology. On the double form *aspa* and *asa* see above, under my discussion of *sp* in Ancient Persian.

§19, *lines 90–96*. Saith Darius the king: Afterward I went to Babylon. When I had not come to Babylon, there is a place, Zazāna by name, on the Euphrates. There that Nidintubel, who called himself Nebuchadrezzar, went against me with an army to make battle. Afterward we made battle. Ormazd brought me help. By the grace of Ormazd I killed the army of Nidintubel at will. The enemy plunged (?) in the water. The water bore him away. Of the month Anāmaka two days were in course. Then we made battle.

[1] I scarcely think that the similarity in form of the New Sus. *Anšu-a-ab-ba*^{id} and *Anšu-kur-ra*^{id} 'camel' and 'horse' (Weisbach, so also Foy, ZDMG. LII 593) can be any support of a rendering by 'chariot-borne' of *iša-bārim* (!).

Digitized by Google

[*a*]*hą*[*jat*]*ā*: While the meaning is tolerably clear, the text is very corrupt. WB.'s reading here must be connected with the Skt. root *sañj* 'hang.' Bartholomae, AF. I 61, took *āpiyā* as an instrumental and read as his verb-form *ahadatā* = Skt. *asahata* 'was overpowered by the water.' Foy, KZ. XXXV 36, would return to the reading of Kern, ZDMG. XXIII 239, *āhyatā* from √*ah* 'throw.' Müller, WZKM. I 222, suggested *aharpatā* (cf. Skt. √*sarp*), but this gives six letters when only five are allowed us in the lacuna in the inscription itself. Oppert's reading of *aharatā* (Skt. √*sar*), Le peuple . . . des Mèdes, 169, 'in aquam fugit,' is exceedingly good, in my judgment. Either this *aharatā* or the *āhyatā* of Kern and Foy (adopted also by Rugarli, "il nemico fu gettato nell' acqua") is to be adopted. The New Sus. has here *puttana* 1. sg. aor. caus. to the root *pu* 'go,' cf. Foy, ZDMG. LII 580. The New Susian and the Ancient Persian do not, therefore, literally correspond here, Oppert, loc. cit.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK CITY. LOUIS H. GRAY.

Digitized by Google

II.—THE TWO RECENSIONS OF PLAUTUS, *A* AND P^A.

Our manuscript evidence for Plautus consists in reality of two ancient texts. One of them, the Ambrosian Palimpsest (*A*), still exists in a fragmentary and often illegible condition; the other (P^A), the proto-archetype of all other existing MSS, disappeared in or about the tenth century. Shortly before the disappearance of P^A, at least two copies of it were made, both of which are now lost. The contents of part of one copy we know from that collation of the Codex Turnebi (*T*) which was recently discovered in the Bodleian Library; the contents of the other (*P*) we can infer from a comparison of its descendants, our existing minuscule MSS, *B*, *C*, *D*, etc. While *A* seems to have belonged to N. Italy, the home of P^A was apparently Central France. By a singular good fortune these two ancient texts represent two rival recensions or editions of our author.

The existence of discrepant versions of Plautus is only natural. His plays were revived on the stage some time after his death (cf. Cas. prol.); and stage-managers would inevitably find occasion to shorten one scene or lengthen another, or replace an old-fashioned word or phrase by its new equivalent. Side by side with this deterioration went the restorative labours of learned men like Aelius Stilo and Varro, who exerted themselves to discover the 'ipsa verba' of the ancient poet. In Festus' compendium of the Dictionary of Verrius Flaccus, a dictionary composed in the time of Augustus, four of the quotations from Plautus are cited in a double form—one form, we may surmise, being the actual composition of Plautus, while the other is the alteration of some stage-manager. The Grammarian Charisius, who lived about the time when *A* (perhaps also P^A) was published, speaking of a passage in the Bacchides (v. 545), says 'it is not found in some copies' (in quibusdam non ferunt). If one applied for a copy of Plautus from a bookseller of, let us say, the fourth century A. D., one would, I fancy, have to specify which edition was wanted, just as nowadays one might select either the 'actor's' edition or the 'student's' edition of Shakspeare. Under the conditions that regulated the publishing of books in the ancient world, it would

Digitized by Google

be impossible for these separate editions to retain in full their different characteristics; for the setting of a verse in one recension would often be entered as a variant in the margin of a copy of the other recension; and when a transcription came to be made of the volume, these marginal (or interlinear) adscripts would often find their way into the text, producing 'mixed' versions. Aulus Gellius in his gossip about the books and booksellers of his time makes allusion to such a state of things. He mentions, for example (Noct. Att. IX 14), that in copies of the History of Claudius Quadrigarius he found the genitive form *facies* with *facii* added in the margin (sed 'facies' in ordinem scriptum fuit, et contra per i geminum 'facii').

Our two survivals (if we may include P^4 under this designation) from the vast number of copies of Plautus in the ancient Roman world—one of them, as we have seen, a publication of N. Italy, the other of Central France—shew, both of them, traces of this 'mixture' of text. In the main they are representatives of two distinct recensions. Thus *A*, in whose extant fragments three of the four passages are preserved, which Festus cites in divergent form, exhibits in each of the three the one variant mentioned by Festus, while P^4 exhibits the other: the Bacchides passage specified by Charisius is omitted in *A*, but is present in P^4; and we may congratulate ourselves on the extraordinary good-nature of Fortune which has determined that, although only two ancient texts have been transmitted to us, these two should represent the two rival forms in which the text of Plautus seems to have been presented to the ancient world. But, as an example or two will shew, it would be a mistake to regard our two survivals as if they were two standard copies, such as might be preserved in a national library as perfect specimens of the rival recensions. In Pseud. 864 one recension ended the line with *conquiniscito*, the other with *ceueto simul* (a reading preserved for us by Nonius). *Conquiniscito* is the reading of *A*, but in P^4 we find the unmetrical ending *conquiniscito simul*:

si cónquiníscet istic, cónquiniscito simul.

The reading of the other recension had been written above the line:

conquiniscito
si conquiniscet istic, ceueto simul,

and had been mistaken by a transcriber for a correction of the word *ceueto*. Similarly in Pseud. 392 the rival versions were:

Digitized by Google

ex multis, exquire ex illis unum qui certus siet (P^A),

and

ex multis, ex illis paucis unum qui certust cedo.

The latter version was that of the archetype of *A*. But the intrusion of the variant *al(ias) exquire ex illis* into some copy has produced this 'mixed' version in *A*:

ex multis atque exquire ex illis paucis unum qui certust cedo.

In these two examples the reading of the rival recension has only blurred, not wholly effaced, the original version. But in Pseud. 955 only one of the rival versions appears in our two texts:

nón prorsus, uerum éx transuerso cédit, quasi cancér solet,

the other, apparently the genuine form, would have been lost to us, had it not been for a citation by Varro (L. L. VII 81):

út transuersus, nón prouersus, cédit, quasi cancér solet.

We must therefore see in *A* and P^A copies indeed, but only 'blurred' copies, of two distinct recensions of Plautus.

Another cause that has confused their outlines is the inevitable tendency of scribes to make mistakes. The immediate original of *A* has, we may be sure, by no means been faithfully transcribed in *A* itself, and the remote archetype of *A* is still less faithfully reproduced. The case of P^A is even worse. In the parts for which we have not the evidence of *T*, all that we can appeal to is the testimony of *P*; and who can say how many errors have been made by the mediaeval German monk (or monks) who transcribed *P*? Could we discover P^A, we should certainly find that in scores of passages it had identically the same text as *A*, where our MSS—*B*, *C*, *D*, etc.—all exhibit a divergent reading, a reading that originated in the carelessness of the scribe of *P*. Here are some examples which the newly found collation of *T* has revealed to us: Pers. 536 *mihi* AP^A, om. P; 629 *eueniant* AP^A, *conueniant* P; Poen. 310 *quia* AP^A, *qui* P; 472 *quom* AP^A, *quo* P; 860 *dignus qui siet* AP^A, om. P; 977 *punicast guggast homo* AP^A, om. P; 1019 *tu aliud sapis* AP^A, *tua* P; 1036 *tu* P, om. AP^A; 1204 *addunt* AP^A, om. P. And on the other hand a great deal of the apparent harmony of *A* with our minuscule MSS is equally specious. In Pseud. 1326 the mistake of *reddi* for *redi* is found in *A*. It did not appear in P^A, nor yet in *P*, but it intruded itself into that transcript of *P* which was the original of our MSS, *C* and *D*. In Trin. 530 the same mistake, *reddit* for *redit*, is

Digitized by Google

found in *A* and in *P*. But how can we be sure that it was also found in P^4 and did not first intrude itself into that transcript of P^4 which we call *P*? Errors of this kind are at all times a temptation to a scribe, and there is every possibility that the scribe of *A* and the scribe of some text of the other recension fell into them independently. We have therefore no right to take for granted, as is generally done, that *A* and P^4 exhibited a 'consensus' in such errors as Trin. 773 *gererem* for *gerere rem*, Pseud. 98 *libellae* for *libellai*, Poen. 876 *resistam* for *res sistam*, 669 *accurres* for *accures*. It is extraordinary how many writers on the subject of the two recensions of Plautus have assumed that, because natural miswritings like these are found in our extant minuscule MSS, they must have been present in P^4, and even, a still more dangerous inference, that their presence in *A* proves that they existed in some imaginary original from which both *A* and P^4 were derived. A much less natural miswriting, *hamum* for *hamulum*, has been made in Stich. 289 independently by the scribe of the original of *C* and *D* and by the scribe of *A* (or the original of *A*). The reading of P^4 and of *P* (as of *B*) was *hamulum*. Had *B* not retained the true form, we should have imagined that *hamum* was the reading of *P* and of P^4 (cf. Pers. 572 *anulum* for *anellum*). The discovery of the collation of *T* has opened our eyes to the number of errors introduced into the text for the first time by the scribe of *P*. Great care, therefore, is necessary in compiling a list of the passages in which *A* and P^4 exhibit either on the one hand a divergence of reading, or on the other a 'consensus' in error. And even when we have clear evidence for the reading of *A* and P^4, we have still to assure ourselves whether *A* and P^4 in this respect offer a faithful or a blurred reflection of the two rival recensions from which they have sprung.

The problem, therefore, of reconstructing the two ancient recensions of Plautus is as difficult as it is fascinating. The more ancient and therefore presumably genuine form is the reading of *A* in a large number of passages, e. g. Pseud. 432 *fors fuat an istaec* A, *forsitan ea tibi* P; Trin. 88 *quid siet* A, *quicquid est* P; Pseud. 315 *meliora faxint* and *face* A, *melius faciant* and *fac hoc* P; Truc. 197 *opperimino* A, *opperire ibi* P. But not always, e. g. Trin. 328 *nisi tu nonuis* A, *si tu non neuis* P (unless the *A*-reading is a corruption of *nisi tu noenu uis*). Truc. 375 *rei pepercisses* A, *rei item parsisses* P (Spengel proposed *repersisses*

Digitized by Google

as the true reading and the reading in the original of *A*). In Trin. 70, *A* preserves the old form *obiurigem*, which in *P* shews a questionable 'modernized' form, designed to save the metre, *obiurgitem*; but in v. 68 it is *A* which has *obiurgitem*, while *P* has *obiurgem*. A curious variation is Stich. 586 *sustentatum est* A, *sustentaui* P; Truc. 369 *ambulatumst* A, *ambulasti* P. Interesting, too, is Truc. 245 *demum oggerunt* A, *demus danunt* P. In Poen. 343 the apparently unmetrical ending of *A* seems to be a concession to decorum. There is an alternative passage in iambic senarii to take the place of the lyric canticum at the beginning of the Stichus in *P*, but not in *A*.

The newly found collation of *T* has thrown a good deal of light on the arrangement of the cantica in P^A; for *T* retained the line-division of P^A, while *P* often departed from it by writing two short lines as one, for the sake of saving space. We now know that P^A exhibited the same method of colometry as *A*, the longest lines beginning at the extreme left-hand margin of the page (*ἐν ἐκθέσει*), the shortest near the middle of the page (*ἐν εἰσθέσει*). This method is often followed nowadays in printed texts of the Latin and Greek dramatists, and is not so remote from our usage as the practice, already mentioned, of inserting variant readings in the margin or between the lines; whereas in our books they are printed at the bottom of the page. Another kind of marginal adscript, equally productive of error, was employed for the sake of indicating that this or that passage might or should be omitted in acting the play. The method of indicating this seems to have been to adscribe at the beginning of the passage the line or lines which immediately follow the passage and which were themselves rewritten at their proper place. This extraordinary practice has, as may be imagined, led to great confusion. Thus in Trin. 361 sqq., where Lysiteles is talking with his father, Philto:

LYS. Ne opprobra, pater; multa eueniunt homini quae uolt, quae neuolt.
PHIL. Mentire edepol, gnate, atque id nunc facis haud consuetudine.
nam sapiens quidem pol ipsus fingit fortunam sibi:
eo non multa quae neuolt eueniunt, nisi fictor malust.
LYS. Multa illi opera opust ficturae, qui se fictorem probum 365
uitae agundae esse expetit: sed hic admodum adulescentulust.
PHIL. Non aetate, uerum ingenio apiscitur sapientia;
sapienti aetas condimentum, sapiens aetati cibust.
agedum eloquere, quid dare illi nunc uis? LYS. Nil quicquam, pater,

the possibility of omitting vv. 362–368 appears to have been

Digitized by Google

indicated in this or some similar fashion, with the result that in *A* v. 369 and in P^4 both this line and its neighbour have been transposed to the place of v. 362. Strictly speaking, it would be natural to find the passage in one recension retained and in the other omitted; so that these marginal indications of feasible omission are perhaps due to 'mixture' of recensions. In the last scene of the Captivi the single line (v. 1023)

núnc edepol demum ín memoriam régrediŏr audísse me (*A*)

was in the other recension supplanted by a passage of seven lines (vv. 1016–22), ending with

núnc demum in memóriam redeo, cúm mecum recógito;

and that the single-line version is the older and more genuine may be inferred from the old scansion *regrediŏr* which it contains. Here too there is a trace of 'mixture'; for in *P* this older line appears in the text at the conclusion of the alternative passage, so that we have the meaningless repetition:

nunc demum in memoriam redeo, cum mecum recogito,
nunc edepol demum in memoriam regredior, audisse me
quasi per nebulam, Hegionem meum patrem uocarier.

(Omission of a passage through homoeoteleuton or homoeoarcton must not be assigned to a difference of recension, e. g. Epid. 597–9 *om. A.*)

Besides divergence of words, phrases, and whole passages, there are other points of distinction between the two recensions. Often one arrangement of a canticum appears in one recension and a different arrangement in the other. Pseud. 1329 sq., for example, are in *A* treated as a long bacchiac series, but in P^4 as a bacchiac trimeter catalectic followed by a long cretic series. There are other instances; and the list would no doubt be larger, if we had sure evidence (as supplied by *T* in the Pseudolus, Poenulus, Persa and Rudens) for the arrangement of the cantica throughout P^4. 'Mixture' of colometry is scarcely conceivable. The colometry of one recension might oust the colometry of the other, but could hardly be notified in the margin in the way that a variant reading or an alternative passage was indicated.

Again, the order of the plays was different. The order in the recension followed by *A* we do not know in the case of the first three plays. For the rest it was: Bacch., Capt., Curc., Cas., Cist., Epid., Merc., Most., Mil., Men., Trin., Truc., Vid., Poen., Pers.,

Digitized by Google

Pseud., Rud., Stich. The order in the other recension was: Amph., Asin., Aul., Bacch., Capt., Curc., Cas., Cist., Epid., Most., Men., Mil., Merc., Pseud., Poen., Pers., Rud., Stich., Trin., Truc., Vid. In *P* the Bacchides, in which play (v. 214) there is a mention of the Epidicus:

> etiam Epidicum, quam ego fabulam aeque ac me ipsum amo,
> nullam aeque inuitus specto, si agit Pellio,

was put after the Epidicus; but that in the archetype it stood after the Aulularia is shewn by the gap at the end of the one play (Aul. 832–fin.) and at the beginning of the other. The transposition may be due to some learned Carolingian abbot, under whose direction a transcript was made from P^A. Whether the curious position of the Trinummus, Truculentus and Vidularia in *A* should be attributed to the recension of which *A* is a copy or to the mistake of a transcriber[1] is not clear.

There is also a difference of scene-headings; but how far precisely the divergences may be traced past *A* and P^A to the rival recensions themselves is difficult to decide, partly because of the imperfect state of these headings in the Ambrosian Palimpsest in its present condition, partly because of an accident which interrupted the transmission of them in copies of the other recension (see Prescott, in Harvard Studies, vol. XI).

Nor should we lay too much stress on the presence of the didascaliae in *A* and their absence from P^A, nor yet on the absence from *A* (in its original form) of the arguments. There were two series of arguments for the plays, one series being acrostic; but we have hardly the right to assume that the one or the other series was a characteristic of the one or the other recension. The arguments are, of course, late compositions.

Now that we have full knowledge of the contents and form of *A*—thanks to Studemund's Apograph (Weidmann, Berlin, 1889) —and now that the newly found collation of *T* has thrown light on the contents and form of P^A, it is to be hoped that some one will undertake the task of reconstructing, so far as is possible, the ancient rival recensions of which these codices are representatives. The monographs of Niemeyer, De Plauti fabularum recensione

[1] Not of a binder; for at the end of the Menaechmi we read

T. [MACCI PLA]VTI
MENAECHMI EXP[L·] INC· TRINVMMVS
FELICITER

Digitized by Google

duplici (Berlin, 1877), and Baier, De Plauti fabularum recensionibus Ambrosiana et Palatina (Breslau, 1885), were written before this knowledge of *A* and P^A was available. The full information, too, that Goetz's Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum now provides regarding the glossaries or ancient dictionaries will facilitate the detection of readings in *A* or P^A which are rather errors of transcription, due to the substitution of a suprascript gloss for the actual word of the text, than varieties of reading. *Rogo*, for example, is the stock explanation of O.Lat. *oro* in the dictionaries of the Empire; and so *rogas*, the reading of *A* in Most. 682 (cf. P^A in Pers. 321):

bonum aequomque oras,

is not to be attributed to the recension which *A* embodies, but merely to the error of a scribe who found in his original

rogas
bonum aequomque oras

and miscopied it as

bonum aequomque rogas.

Totus is similarly the stock explanation of O.Lat. *perpes*; and so *totam* was in some original of *A* written above *perpetem* (*-im*) in Truc. 278:

noctem in stramentis pérnoctare pérpetim.

The transcriber mistook the suprascript word, not for a correction (as in the line of the Mostellaria just quoted), but for an omission, producing in *A* the unmetrical line

noctem in stramentis pernoctare perpetim totam.

Care will be needed for the removal of such variants from the list of divergent readings of the rival recensions, and, on the other hand, in detecting a 'consensus' in error of *A* and P^A that has arisen through the same cause. In Poen. 1317, for example, *cur non*, the reading of *A* and of *P*, may not be the original reading of either recension, but may have found its way at different times into *A* (or some original) and P^A (or some original) through the suprascription of the gloss *cur non* over the word of the text, *quin*. Among other passages that may be mentioned in this connexion are: Merc. 300 *benest* A, *bonum est* P; 314 *plane decrepitus* A, *vetulus decrepitus* P (cf. Epid. 666); Pers. 408 *periure* A, *iniure* P^A; Pseud. 43 *impertit* A, *mittit* P; 232 *nihil curassis* A, *bene curassis* (if miswritten for *ne curassis*) P; 397 *neque paratust quicquam* A, *neque parata gutta* P; 417 *ante-*

Digitized by Google

ueniat A, *antecedat* P; 901 *fortiter* A, *firmiter* P^A; 1142 *ipsus ipsum* A, *ipsus coram* P; Stich. 455 *logis* A, *meis* P; 523 *ubi* A, *sī* P; Trin. 1071 *hic* A, *ipsus* P; Truc. 260 *in nostra domo* A, *nostrae domi* P; 363 *puer* A, *mihi* P. Cas. 702 is an instructive example of how glosses marred the two texts:

ut núbat mihi—íllud quidém uolébam,
nostró uilicó;

for the peculiar phrase *illud quidem uolebam*, 'I meant to say,' has brought glosses, but, fortunately, different glosses, into *A* (*dicere uolebam*) and *P* (*uolebam non sed*). In Mil. 599 the single gloss *auribus* seems to have occasioned the extra line in *P*.

A still more difficult task will be to determine what divergences of reading are due merely to faulty transcription of a scribe and are not to be referred to the ancient recensions themselves. The scribe of *P*, for example, when pressed for space seems to have followed a practice, unfortunately too common in early minuscule writing, of omitting the final syllable of a word and indicating the omission by a horizontal stroke above. A divergence of reading between *A* and our minuscule MSS that consists merely of difference of termination is often liable to suspicion on this account, e. g. Epid. 224 *facimus* A, *faciunt* BVEJ, where *P* may have had *facī* (i. e. *facimus*). Again, divergences like Stich. 435, *hasce* A, *eas* P, may not be real divergences of the ancient recensions. Both may have had *hasce*, but at some time or other in the transmission of the 'Palatine' text a scribe may have miscopied the unfamiliar word as *eas*. A careful estimate of the possibility and probability of faulty transcription by ancient or mediaeval scribes will greatly reduce the list of apparent divergences of reading in the two recensions. It will also diminish the examples of 'consensus' in error. The besetting sins of scribes of all periods, such as the 'modernizing' of archaic forms, haplography, etc., have been already mentioned; and a little study of the critical apparatus of the large Teubner edition of Plautus will convince us how inevitable are such corruptions as *euenial* for *euenat* (Trin. 41), *ul* for *uti* (Stich. 193 and passim), *possum* for *potis* (*pote*) *sum* (Pseud. 355), *opinor* for *opino* (Bacch. 487 and passim), *illi* (dat.) for *illic* (Mil. 351, etc.), besides *illic* (adv.) for *illi*, *illum* for *illunc* (Poen. 1302, etc.), *-ae* (gen.) for *-aī* (Pseud. 98, etc.), as well as misspellings like *habeas* for *abeas* (Pseud. 393), *scimus* for *simus* (Pseud. 683), *honestam* for *onustam* (Pseud. 1306), *hostium* for *ostium* (Most. 768). The newly found evidence of *T*

Digitized by Google

shews us how often such errors originated in *P* and were not found in P^4, even when they appear in *A* [e. g. Pers. 442 *quum* (*cum*) P^A, *quin* AP]. Similarly, the evidence of *B* shews us when they are to be referred to the scribe of the original of *C* and *D* and not to the scribe of *P* (e. g. Trin. 371 *tolerabilis* ACD, *tolerabis* P; Mil. 374 *mihi possunt* ACD, *possunt mihi* P). No argument whatever regarding the ancient recensions can be based on 'consensus' in errors of this description, even though such 'consensus' could be established for *A* and P^4. In Poen. 365 we have the express testimony of Nonius and Gellius that Plautus wrote *mea delicia*. This O.Lat. unfamiliar form appears in the familiar guise *meae deliciae* in *A* and P^4; but it would be rash to assert that *meae deliciae* was the deliberate reading of the editor of one or other (or both) of the rival recensions, and not a mere mistake committed separately by transcribers of the text.

Other possibilities of specious, not real, 'consensus' in error are more difficult to determine. In Truc. 227 the alliteration of neighbouring words, which always furnishes a handle for transposition, has misled both the scribe of *A* and the scribe of *P*. The line runs:

meretrícem similem séntis esse cóndecet,

but *A* offers *sentis similem esse* and *P* had *esse similem sentis*. Both scribes have made the same mistake of transposition, but, fortunately, their deviation from their original has taken different directions. All the same, there was an even chance of a 'consensus' in error whose accidental nature might have passed undetected. Similarly in Truc. 383:

quod tu híc me absente nóui negoti gésseris?

A's transposition is *me hic absente*, while *P*'s is *hic absente me*. Although there was no alliteration in this phrase to tempt to transposition, this error has been made independently by both scribes, but, fortunately, in different forms. In Men. 201:

Hércules haud aéque magno umquam ábstulit perículo,

the alliterative words have been transposed in the same way in both *A* and *P*, *haud Hercules*. But can we be sure that the error has not been made independently in the one text and in the other? Festus quotes the words in their proper order. In Mil. 727–9:

sícut merci prétium statuit quí est probus agoránomus:
quaé probast mers, prétium ei statuit, pró uirtute ut uéneat,
quae ímprobast, pro mércis uitio dóminum pretio paúperat,

Digitized by Google

the similarity of the clauses led to omission, but, fortunately, not to the same omission, in *P* (*om.* qui est—statuit) and in *A* (*om.* mers—improbast). Like examples are Poen. 389 sqq., and apparently Stich. 262, etc. But the most irresistible of all temptations to a scribe was the temptation to haplography, to write a repeated word or syllable once instead of twice. It would hardly be rash to assert that there is not a repeated word or syllable in a line of Plautus which in some MS or other has not come to suffer haplography. If Plautus wrote:

Pseud. 443 Ὦ Ζεῦ, Ζεῦ, quam pauci éstis homines cómmodi!,
Stich. 384 iám, iam non facio aúctionem: mi óbtigit heréditas,
Poen. 1272 cur, cúr numero estis mórtui, hoc exémplo ut pingerétis?,
969 cretást, cretast profécto horum hominum orátio,

we have no right to ascribe the haplography in *A* and *P* or P^A (*Ζεῦ, iam, cur, cretast*) to a common original of *A* and P^A. Such a mistake would with the utmost ease be made independently by different scribes.

Of late there has been a tendency to minimize the indications of different origin of *A* and P^A, although these indications are so strong and unmistakable—difference of text, difference in arrangement of cantica, difference in the order of the plays. Cases of 'mixture' of text have been put forward as a proof that both recensions came from some original 'variorum' edition of the collected plays, an edition crammed with variant readings; and the divergence of the two recensions is referred to the choice by transcribers, now of the reading of the text, now of the marginal variant. It seems to me that the account given above—viz. that the reading of one recension came in course of time to be entered in the margin of the other recension, and from there found its way into the text—is a much more natural and likely explanation. In fact, we can trace the same process still going on in *A* and in P^A themselves (or their originals). In Pseud. 1207, *impium*, the reading of P^A, is entered in the margin of *A*, whose reading is *impurum*, while in Pseud. 880 what was a marginal (or interlinear) variant in the original has retained a place, but not its right place, in *A* (*tu illos* P^A and A-text, *tuos* A-margin). In Pseud. 1207 *abduceret*, the reading of *A*, is entered in the margin of P^A, whose reading is *arcesseret*, and so on. A study of the divergent readings of *A* and P^A leaves the impression rather of two different editions which had in many passages been assimilated through

Digitized by Google

the adoption by one of some readings of the other, than of two copies of the same edition which were beginning to exhibit points of dissimilarity. And yet some advocates of unity of origin for the two codices go so far as to ascribe certain apparent instances of 'consensus' in error to the existence of holes in the pages of this supposed original, and to estimate the number of lines which each imaginary page must have contained. This is surely to forget that *A* and P^4 are two out of a vast number of ancient copies of Plautus, belonging to different parts of the Roman world, with as much likelihood of being related to each other as two copies of Shakspeare, published, let us say, at the interval of a century or half a century, the one at Glasgow and the other at Melbourne. The great argument used by the supporters of such theories is the 'consensus' in error of the two ancient codices. They confront us with an imposing list of lines in which the reading of *A* and of P^4 is the same, and apparently erroneous. Year by year these lists grow smaller; for, as our knowledge of Plautine diction and prosody grows, we recognize the correctness of this or that reading supported by the 'consensus' of *A* and P^4. Before 1892, when Prof. Skutsch published the first volume of his Forschungen, with its interesting discovery of the suppression of final *ĕ* in *ille*, *nempe*, *inde*, *proinde*, etc., in Plautus' verse, just as in all literature in *atque* (*ac*), *neque* (*nec*), *neue* (*neu*), lines like Stich. 175:

quia inde iam á pausillo púero ridiculús fui

used to form a considerable part of these lists. Rud. 538 will, I presume, be omitted from them, now that Prof. Skutsch has shewn us that *auderem* has its old pronunciation *aviderem*:

Qui? Quía auderem técum in nauem ascéndere.

The whole history of Plautine textual criticism in recent years has taught us that truth lies, if anywhere, in the 'consensus' of *A* and P^4, and that the danger in tampering with a reading supported by *A* alone or *P* (or P^4) alone is not nearly so great as the danger of discarding the combined testimony of the 'two witnesses.' No judge will arrive at a correct verdict who does not weigh the evidence. The evidence of AP^4 must outweigh the single evidence of *P*. The practice of emending lines of Plautus without stating whether the reading which is impugned rests on the authority of *P* only, or of P^4 only, or of *A* only, or of *A* and P^4 combined, obscures the conditions of the problem

Digitized by Google

to the reader and encourages the writer to reject genuine readings too hastily. The whole weight of tradition supports the reading *penitus* (in its original sense of 'from inside') in Pseud. 132:

atque ípse egreditur pénitus (*intus* edd.), periurí caput.

Are we as much justified in substituting *intus* in this line as we might be in a line for which we had no better evidence than the Carolingian MS *P*? In Stich. 704, does not the 'consensus' of *AP* in the reading *in lecticis* rather point to some Plautine coinage like *inlectice* (adv.) of the type of *accubuo* (Truc. 422)?

STICH. Nímium lepide in méntem uenit: pótius quam in subséllio
Cýnice hic accipimúr quam inlectice (*in lectis* edd.). SAG. Immo enim nimio hic dúlcius.

Must we not retain their reading *stultitiis* in Trin. 509, and give *de* the sense of 'after' or 'in consequence of' (as in Cas. 415, etc.)?

nám is (*sc.* ager) de stultitiís (*diuitiis* edd.) meis
solús superfit praéter uitam rélicuos.

Should we disregard their testimony to the old trisyllabic form of *ergo* adv. (as *iurigo* of *iurgo*, *purigo* of *purgo*) in Poen. 1051?

patrítus er<i>go hóspes Antidamás fuit?

Should we ignore their indication of an O.Lat. *fortasse est* like *necesse est* in Poen. 1004–5?

MIL. Fortásse medicos nós esse arbitrárier.
AGOR. Sĭ ést (Si ita est *edd.*), nega esse: nólo ego errare hóspitem.

And is the phrase *in ius uos uolo* so impossible that we must suppose both *A* and P^4 to be in error in Poen. 1225?

quíd istic? quod faciúndumst cur non ágimus? in ius uós uolo (*uoco* edd.).

Certainly, if we consider the number of lines supported by the 'consensus' of *A* and P^4, whose reading has been justified through advance in our knowledge of Plautus, we shall be inclined to predict that nearly every line so supported will prove to be free from error, unless there be an error into which *A* and P^4 have fallen independently, like the 'modernizing' of an archaic form, e. g. *ridiculisissimos* for *ridiculissimos* (Stich. 389), haplography, or some other equally obvious miswriting, such as *illorum* for *Iliorum* (Bacch. 951), *atque euoca* for *atque uoca* (Poen. 1116), *Euolaticorum* for *E* (the 'nota personae') *uolaticorum* (Poen. 474), *optumi maxumi* for *opt. maxume* (Men. 574), *festiua mulier* for

Digitized by Google

festiuam mulier (Mil. 591). But to argue on the other side is much more easy, for one has ready to hand all the apparent instances of 'consensus' in error which have not yet received their explanation; and, although the number available is diminishing steadily, there still remains a sufficient quantity to provide a respectable case. A large list of instances is furnished by lines which shew hiatus. These, however, lose their force, if we are to believe (and I do not see how we can venture to disbelieve) Cicero's express statement that the early poets made extensive use of this license. To discuss the limits within which we may suppose Plautus to have used it would, however, take too much space here.[1]

Even if real cases of 'consensus' in error, these lines with hiatus would hardly justify the theory of so close a relation between *A* and P^4 as is assumed. Prof. Leo has shewn the likelihood that in the early Empire unrestricted hiatus was believed to be a feature of Plautine verse, and that a 'versus hians' would be accepted without question by all editors of Plautus. The strongest argument that has been produced in favour of the close relation of *A* and P^4 is the appearance at Merc. 598 of two lines which belong to another part of the play (vv. 842–3). In P^4 the passage stood so:

(CHAR.) sed isne est, quem currentem uideo? ipsus est, ibo obuiam. 598
EVT. Diuom atque hominum quae spectatrix atque era eadem es hominibus, 842
spem speratam quom obtulisti hanc mihi, tibi grates ago. 843
CHAR. Nunc, quod restat, ei disperii: uoltus neutiquam huius placet; 599
tristis incedit,—pectus ardet, haereo,—quassat caput. 600
Eutyche. EVT. Eu, Charine. CHAR. Priusquam recipias anhelitum, 601

In *A* only the beginnings of the lines are legible. First comes a line beginning *sed isne* (v. 598), then a line (too long to be written in a single verse) beginning *di—*, then a line beginning *spes*, then a line beginning *nuncq—*, then a line beginning *se . . . q—*, then a line beginning *tr—*, then either one or two lines (perhaps a scene-heading) of which not a single letter can be read, then a line beginning *Eutyche* and ending *quam recipi*[*as*] *anhelitum*. The lines (vv. 842–3)

diuom atque hominum quae spectatrix atque era eadem es hominibus,
spem speratam quom obtulisti hanc mihi, tibi grates ago

[1] I have attempted to do so elsewhere, in the English Journal of Philology for this year.

Digitized by Google

are suitable in the place where they appear later in the play, after v. 841 (the leaves of *A* which contained this part of the play have been lost). There Eutychus reappears on the stage, charged with joyful tidings,—not, as here, with a message of sorrow;—and it is argued that by some extraordinary mistake a scribe entered them in the margin or inserted them in the text at this place, and did not take the trouble to erase them. From a text marred by this blunder, it is said, both P^A and *A* have been transcribed. Another explanation is possible—namely, that Eutychus, at his two appearances on the stage with his two messages, had much the same form of words put into his mouth by the dramatist, and that in P^A his utterance at his first appearance was by a blunder assimilated to his second utterance. If we could recover the rest of the two lines in *A*, they would, on this theory, exhibit their correct form. I do not think this piece of evidence for a close connexion of *A* and P^A is strong enough to overcome the mass of facts that speak against this connexion. And it is, so far as I know, the strongest piece of evidence that has yet been alleged.[1]

W. M. LINDSAY.

[1] Poen. 1168 seems to be correctly preserved by *A* and (in the main) by P^A. *In* has the sense of 'like, after the fashion of':

AGOR. Sed eccás uideo ipsas. HAN. Haécine meae sunt fíliae?
quantae é quantillis iám sunt factae! AGOR. Scín quid est?
Thraecaé sunt; in celónem (*sunt celumne* P^A) sustollí solent.

On Mil. 1419, Stich. 620 see Seyffert in Berl. Phil. Woch. XVI (1896), p. 234. In Poen. 331, why may not *insecundo* (cf. Auct. ad Herenn. IV 56) be formed from *insequor* in the same way as *secundo* from *sequor*? In Cas. 571 *prius* is the original scansion of the word, and *contor*, the simple verb of which *percontor* is a compound, is by no means impossible; in Stich. 223 *Hercúlĕs te amabit* is a most natural parenthetical exclamation to an imaginary bidder; in v. 243 of the same play *eu ecastor* seems to be 'extra metrum,' like *attat* in Cas. 619 (cf. Mar. Vict. 85); in Pseud. 306 *iustus* need not be altered, nor in v. 442 *idné tŭ*; in Mil. 254 *quae mentibitur* has the same construction as Ennius' *uitam uiuitur* (where *uitam* can not be acc. of time).

Digitized by Google

III.—CHRONOLOGICAL STUDIES IN THE GREEK TRAGIC AND COMIC POETS.

Surprisingly little progress has been made since the first half of the present century in clearing up the dark points in the chronology of the minor Greek tragic and comic poets. This fact is at once a tribute to the epoch-making work of Clinton, Meineke, and Welcker, who all possessed in a remarkable degree the combination of wide learning and critical acumen necessary for the several important tasks to which they addressed themselves, and a testimony to the inadequate and often corrupt character of the available chronological data with which later scholars have had to be content. It is safe to say that practically all has been done that can be done in the way of new combinations of the old material, and not always to the advantage of our science. If one will but take the pains to glance at the current and the older handbooks under the names of the poets whom we propose to discuss, one will find abundant illustrations of how opinion has periodically swayed first away from the conclusions reached by the scholars above mentioned, then back again to them, the same ancient notices doing duty in either case. In the scholarly and well-balanced articles from the pens of Kaibel and Dieterich which are now appearing in the Pauly-Wissowa Encyclopädie we generally find a complete survey of all the data, and conclusions which, on the whole, are not assailable in the present state of our knowledge. If I shall take issue with any of these conclusions it will be, with possibly one exception, because of evidence which has hitherto not been applied to these questions. On any other grounds it would neither be profitable nor justifiable to attempt to reopen the discussion for the sake merely of recording a personal opinion.

The new evidence to which I allude is to be found, for the most part, in the catalogues of victorious tragic and comic poets which I discussed in a recent number of this Journal, now found together under No. 977 of the second volume of the Attic Corpus. The order in which the names occur in these catalogues was determined by the date of the first victory of each poet. If, then, we

Digitized by Google

can fix the date of any given name in the lists, we shall know within very narrow limits the dates of the first victories of the poets immediately succeeding and following, and if we can fix the date of any two names in a given list, the limits are known within which the intervening names must fall. With the information thus gained we may hope in some cases to be able to correct or correctly interpret the often vague or corrupt chronological notices found in Suidas, the hypotheses prefixed to the extant dramas, Eusebius and the other chronographers, Anonymous *περὶ κωμῳδίας* II (Kaibel), the Parian Chronicle, and the statements scattered throughout Greek literature. This has not yet been attempted except in a desultory way and where the conclusions are most obvious; nor could it have been done satisfactorily, in the case of the comic poets, so long as the faulty classification given in the Corpus obtained. I propose to apply the new information thus derived mainly to some of the better known of the minor poets. The results which we shall reach may not always seem conclusive; it is hoped that they may at least be of value in suggesting a new line of inquiry or in giving a new point of view.

Theodectas.—Suidas furnishes almost all of the data which we possess concerning this poet: *Θεοδέκτης Ἀριστάνδρου, Φασηλίτης ἐκ Λυκίας, ῥήτωρ, τραπεὶς δὲ ἐπὶ τραγῳδίας, μαθητὴς Πλάτωνος καὶ Ἰσοκράτους καὶ Ἀριστοτέλους. . . . ἐπὶ τῆς ρζ′* (MSS *ργ′*; *corr.* Clinton) *ὀλυμπιάδος εἶπον* (i. e. Theodectas, Naucrates, Isocrates, and Theopompus) *ἐπιτάφιον ἐπὶ Μαυσώλῳ. . . . δράματα δὲ ἐδίδαξε ν′. τελευτᾷ δὲ ἐν Ἀθήναις ἐτῶν α′ καὶ μ′, ἅτι τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ περιόντος.* Welcker (Die griech. Trag., p. 1070) finds a *terminus ante quem* for his death in the story of Alexander's homage to the poet's statue at Phaselis (Plut., Alex. 17). This was in 334/3. Since Theodectas was 41 years old at the time of his death, he must have been born as early at least as 375, probably a few years earlier. This result has been universally accepted, being consistent with the statement of Suidas that Theodectas was a pupil of Aristotle, who came to Athens in 368, and accounting for the marked respect shown by Alexander, who became the pupil of Aristotle in 343. The young prince may even have known the poet personally.

But the victors' catalogue upsets this most reasonable combination. In frag. *b* we find [Καρκί]νος ΔΙ, [Ἀστ]υδάμας Π[ΙΙ]Ι, [Θεο]δέκτας ΠΙΙ, [Ἀφα]ρεὺς ΙΙ. According to Vit. X Orat. 839 *d*, Aphareus began to exhibit in the archonship of Lysistratus, 368/7, and

Digitized by Google

appeared last in the archonship of Sosigenes, 342/1, winning two victories at the City Dionysia in this period. The acme of Carcinus is placed by Suidas in Ol. 100 (380–77). We learn from Diod. Sic. 5, 5 that he was often in Syracuse during the reign of the younger Dionysius (368 to 356). He must have attained a high position as a tragic poet before he was invited to Syracuse, and probably had won the larger number of his eleven victories before the accession of Dionysius II. The date of the first victory of Astydamas is fixed by the Parian Chronicle in the year 372, as we shall see later. The order of the names Carcinus, Astydamas, and Aphareus is therefore entirely in harmony with the chronological data. If we should assume an interval of three years between each of these four names—and certainly this is a liberal estimate—we should have as approximate dates of the first victories: Carcinus, ca. 376; Astydamas, 372; Theodectas, ca. 368; Aphareus, ca. 362. Since the acme of Carcinus is given as 380–77, it is more probable that his first victory was won before 376 than that Theodectas won later than 368. However, in order to keep as near to Suidas as possible, let us set the first victory of Theodectas forward to 365, though so long an interval is intrinsically improbable.

Theodectas produced 50 tragedies—that is, took part in more than 16 contests. That he devoted himself more especially to the City Dionysia is a fair inference from the fact that seven of his eight victories (Epigram apud Steph. Byz., s. v. Φασηλίς) were won at this festival. By all accounts he had gained an enviable reputation as a rhetor before he turned his attention to tragedy. His talents must have been recognized at an early age. And yet he could hardly have entered upon his career as a poet before the age of 25. To assume a later date would make it necessary to crowd more than three tragedies into each year. Accepting this age for his first appearance at the Dionysia, and assuming that he was victorious in his first competition, his death would fall ca. 350. If he was not successful at once, his death must be placed still earlier—a supposition that is excluded by the fact of his participation in the Mausolus competition in 351. On the other hand, even if nine years elapsed between the first victory of Astydamas and that of Theodectas, and even if the latter took up tragic poetry before the age of 25, his death could not be placed more than a few years after 350. At the closest possible estimate he died from 10 to 15 years earlier than was assumed in Welcker's combination.

Digitized by Google

The year of Theodectas' birth was accordingly not far from 390. He may well have been a pupil of Plato and Isocrates, but he must have been the friend rather than the disciple of Aristotle, who was several years his junior, and not some ten years his senior, as one has supposed hitherto. In this connection it is significant that the Vit. X Orat. (837 *c*) and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (Isaeus, sub fin.) both report that the poet was a pupil of Isocrates, but say nothing of Aristotle. It is evident that Suidas or his source was tempted to bring together the great trio. Theodectas was not a youth of 24 when invited to do honor to the memory of Mausolus in 351, but a mature and accomplished man of 40, whose reputation was firmly established. Alexander could not have known him personally,[1] but learned to esteem the man and his works through the poet's friend and collaborator, Aristotle. This is the meaning of ὁμιλίᾳ in Plutarch's reference to Alexander's act of homage: *οὐκ ἄχαριν ἐν παιδιᾷ τιμὴν ἀποδιδοὺς τῇ γενομένῃ δι' Ἀριστοτέλην καὶ φιλοσοφίαν ὁμιλίᾳ πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα.*

Astydamas, father and son.—Since the date which we have been able to reach for the first victory of Theodectas depends somewhat upon our interpretation of the notice in the Parian Marble for the year 372, it may be well to state here the reasons which oblige us to assume that this chronicle records only first victories. It contains six notices of dramatic victories in a form sufficiently complete to be of service. In three of these the phrase is *πρῶτον ἐνίκησεν*—Aeschylus in 484, Euripides in 441, and Menander in 315 (new frag., Ath. Mitth. 1897, p. 187). The victory of Sophocles in 468 we know from Plutarch, Cimon 8, to have been his first victory, won at the City Dionysia. Philemon is set down as victorious in 327; he could scarcely have won before this date, and we know that his first Lenaean victory was not gained for some years afterward. The omission of *πρῶτον* in the case of Astydamas consequently signifies nothing. When, now, in the catalogue of victors at the City Dionysia we find that a poet Astydamas won his first victory between 376 and 362—and both of these dates, though approximate, are derived from evidence independent of the inscription—the conclusion is irresistible that the victory of Astydamas in 372 was his first victory—indeed, his first City victory—determining the position of his

[1] Pseudo-Callisthenes 3, 17, the only author who asserts the contrary, will not, of course, be accepted as a witness in the matter.

Digitized by Google

name in the victors' list. Thus what was only a shrewd conjecture of Clinton must now be recognized as a demonstrated fact.

We are now confronted by the difficult problems arising out of the notices relative to the elder and the younger Astydamas. According to Suidas, the elder poet, son of Morsimus, wrote 240 plays and won 15 victories. A pupil of Isocrates, he afterwards turned his attention to tragedy. Of the younger poet Suidas mentions the titles of eight plays, giving no details concerning his career. Diodorus Sic. 14, 43, gives this notice about the elder Astydamas: *Ἀστυδάμας ὁ τραγῳδογράφος τότε πρῶτον* (archonship of Aristocrates, 399/8) *ἐδίδαξεν,*[1] *ἔζησε δὲ ἔτη ἑξήκοντα.* So far there is nothing to excite suspicion except the statement of Suidas that the elder Astydamas was a pupil of Isocrates. This is clearly impossible if the date furnished by Diodorus is correct.

But another set of notices introduces some grave contradictions with this evidence. Suidas, Photius, Zenobius, and Schol. Liban., Epist. 317, p. 153, assign the Parthenopaeus (which is not among the eight plays of the younger poet enumerated in Suidas) to the elder Astydamas, son of Morsimus.[2] They explain the origin of the well-known proverb *σαυτὴν ἐπαινεῖς*, relating the story of the self-laudatory inscription composed by the poet for the basis of the statue voted in his honor after the performance of the Parthenopaeus. So long as the date of this play was unknown, there was nothing improbable in its attribution to Astydamas the father. But the programme of the tragic contest at the Dionysia of the year 340 (CIA. II 973) mentions the Parthenopaeus as one of the two plays of the victor, Astydamas.[3]

If Diodorus is right, the elder poet died ca. 358. We now have two difficulties in the tradition, assuming that the account of Diodorus is trustworthy: 1) the mistake of making the elder poet a pupil of Isocrates, and 2) the contradiction involved in ascribing the Parthenopaeus to him.

[1] Chandler used this notice for the restoration of Mar. Par., ll. 80 f.: *ἀφ' οὗ Ἀ[στυδάμας πρῶτον ἐδίδαξεν] Ἀθήνησιν . . . ἄρχοντος Ἀθήνησιν Ἀριστοκράτους.* But the first two letters of the name are given as either AI or AΠ, so that no weight can be attached to this conjecture.

[2] Suidas, s. v. *σαυτὴν ἐπαινεῖς*; Photius, II 143, the same, word for word, as in Suidas; Zenobius 5, 100, the same story cast into a slightly different form. See Prager, Insc. Metric. 158, for the numerous allusions to the proverb. Dörpfeld, Gr. Theat., p. 70, is wrong in thinking that the inscription proposed by the poet was actually inscribed on the monument.

[3] By an oversight, Dieterich gives the date as 368.

Digitized by Google

Susemihl, who has discussed this question most recently (Rhein. Mus. 49, 1894, p. 473), attaches great importance to the statement of Suidas about Isocrates. He sees that both difficulties can be removed if we but assume that Diodorus is in error, rather than Suidas, as has been generally believed.[1] The source of all the trouble, he holds, is in the date of the poet's first appearance, which ought to be the date of his birth. If he was *born* in 398, his first victory would be that of 372, and his death would fall in 338. In support of this theory he urges first the great improbability that the elder Astydamas, beginning his career in 398, did not achieve a victory until 372, and crowded the rest of his 15 victories into the next 14 years; and secondly the fact that the solution he adopts involves only one error in the tradition, while every other proposal involves at least two. As to the first of these two arguments, no answer is needed. If the statement of Diodorus is correct, then the victory of 372 must be assigned to the second Astydamas, not to the first, as we have shown. In the second place, the method followed by Susemihl, of adopting the solution that involves the smaller number of corrections in the tradition, is not sound, especially when Suidas is one of our authorities as over against Diodorus. It is better to assume a dozen errors in the former for which we can give a good explanation than one in the latter for which we can not account. Before attempting a simpler method of solving the problem, one word about the ancestors of the elder Astydamas. Philocles, his grandfather, was a nephew of Aeschylus. He was a mature man and an experienced poet in the thirties, when he defeated Sophocles and the Oedipus. His son Morsimus, the father of Astydamas, was held up to ridicule by Aristophanes as early as 424 (Eq. 401). Susemihl admits that, on his hypothesis, he would have been over fifty at the birth of his son, but cheerfully adds: "so etwas kommt ja alle Tage vor." But he was more likely sixty years old in 398, and ten years nearer the record held by Abraham and Masinissa (Appian Pun. 105). So this theory is not without its difficulties even after we have disposed of Diodorus.

We have seen that in the catalogue of victors the name of Astydamas is associated with those of two disciples of Isocrates —Theodectas and Aphareus. The victor of 372, it can hardly be doubted, was also the rhetor-poet of Suidas' first notice. The author of the Parthenopaeus was the more celebrated Astydamas,

[1] See the article of Susemihl for the literature on the question.

Digitized by Google

whose victories numbered 15. So far we are in agreement with Susemihl. Now I think that it can be shown that the elder Astydamas, even if he lived until 338, was probably not the poet of the Parthenopaeus. The story of the laudatory inscription proposed by the poet for himself implies that he was alive when the basis was ready to be inscribed and set up. A part of this basis has been found in the theatre (CIA. II 1363). It was incorporated in the western supporting wall of the auditorium, being so cut as to form the end toward the orchestra (Dörpfeld, Gr. Theat., pp. 38, 71). This portion of the theatre was therefore not completed when the Parthenopaeus was performed. The half-finished building was taken in charge by Lycurgus, whose administration of the finances began in 338, and was pushed to completion in the ensuing years. But possibly, it may be urged, the aged Astydamas submitted his verses while on his death-bed. This too is improbable, for the proverb *σαυτὴν ἐπαινεῖς* seems to have been coined, or at least put in a popular form, by Philemon, who did not begin his career as a poet until the end of the thirties. Now, the line *σαυτὴν ἐπαινεῖς, ὥσπερ Ἀστυδάμας, γύναι* (fr. 190, Kock) would have had distinctly more point and would have been much more likely to raise a laugh if the poet were alive and in the audience, than if he had only a few years before been borne to his grave covered with honors and universally lamented—the last great poet of the line of Aeschylus. These considerations are not advanced as proof, but as lending somewhat greater improbability to an hypothesis which is in itself distinctly improbable.

If, on the other hand, the younger Astydamas was the author of the Parthenopaeus, then not simply the single statement of Suidas concerning Isocrates is wrong, but all of the latter part of the notice. Here lies the solution. The facts that refer to the son have been transferred, by a simple error of transmission, such as abound in Suidas, to the father. The biographical notices should therefore read:

1) *Ἀστυδάμας, υἱὸς Μορσίμου τοῦ Φιλοκλέους, τραγικῶν ἀμφοτέρων, Ἀθηναῖος τραγικός.*

2) *Ἀστυδάμας ὁ νέος, υἱὸς τοῦ προτέρου, τραγικὸς καὶ αὐτός. δράματα αὐτοῦ . . . <ἔγραψε τραγῳδίας σμ' (?), ἐνίκησε ιε'. ἀκροασάμενος δὲ ἦν Ἰσοκράτους, καὶ ἐτράπη ἐπὶ τραγῳδίαν.>*

The error in the notices about the Parthenopaeus may have been due to the confusion of the names—that is, to an error of

Digitized by Google

ignorance—but it was more likely due, as it seems to me, to haplography. The notice in Suidas and Photius may have read originally: *Ἀστυδάμαντι τῷ <Ἀστυδάμαντος τοῦ> Μορσίμου εὐημερήσαντι ἐπὶ τραγῳδίας διδασκαλίᾳ Παρθενοπαίου δοθῆναι ὑπ' Ἀθηναίων εἰκόνος ἀνάθεσιν ἐν θεάτρῳ.* We have assumed two errors in the tradition, it is true, but they were palaeographical errors of a common type; Susemihl made shift with one, but one the correction of which as proposed involves not inconsiderable improbabilities in connection with both the birth and the death of the elder Astydamas, and one which in itself is most difficult to account for.

The Two Apollodori.—Suidas has the following articles on the comic poets Apollodorus, a notice on the grammarian Apollodorus intervening:

1) *Ἀπολλόδωρος, Ἀθηναῖος κωμικός. ἐποίησε δράματα μζ', ἐνίκησε ε'.*

2) *Ἀπολλόδωρος, Γελῶος, κωμικός. σύγχρονος τοῦ κωμικοῦ Μενάνδρου. δράματα αὐτου . . .* (seven titles follow).

An Apollodorus of Carystus is frequently quoted. Before Meineke it was generally believed that there were three comic poets of this name. But, since Suidas does not mention the Carystian, and the Athenian is mentioned by no one but Suidas, Meineke (Hist. Crit., p. 462) identified the latter with the former. This opinion has prevailed hitherto. Kaibel, however (Pauly-Wissowa Encycl., s. v. Apollodorus), now identifies all three.[1] He notes that the articles in Suidas supplement each other, and accordingly concludes that they originally formed a whole, now separated by the misplaced article on the grammarian Apollodorus. He advances the following considerations in support of his view: 1) Two plays included in the list given in Suidas for the Geloan, the *Γραμματειδιοποιός* and the *Ἱέρεια*, are cited under the name of the Carystian also. 2) Other plays, not in the list, are referred to under both names and by the simple name of Apollodorus. The latter is most usual. 3) In the didascalia of the Phormio and in the commentary of Donatus, in Aul. Gell. 2, 23, Anon. *περὶ κωμ.* II (Kaib.), and the list of victors, CIA. II 977 *g*, only one poet of the name is mentioned and no distinguishing epithet is employed. 4) The style of the Geloan and Carystian (and Athenian) is identical.

There are two obvious objections to this view, both of which Kaibel anticipates. In the first place, the existence of the epithets

[1] Meineke, l. c., quotes the opinion of Kuhn to the same effect, with the comment: "nihil habet quo commendetur."

Digitized by Google

Ἀθηναῖος, Γελῶος, and Καρύστιος must be accounted for. But citizenship was very freely bestowed at that time, and Apollodorus may well have been thus honored by two cities besides his own. A more serious matter is that of date. Suidas, as we have seen, calls the Geloan a contemporary of Menander. But this, according to Kaibel, was but another way of saying that he belonged to the New Comedy. So Diphilos in Anonymous (*κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον ἐδίδαξε Μενάνδρῳ*), and Lynceus in Suidas (*σύγχρονος γέγονεν Μενάνδρου τοῦ κωμικοῦ*), and Poseidippus in Suidas (*τρίτῳ ἔτει μετὰ τὸ τελευτῆσαι τὸν Μένανδρον διδάξας*) are all dated in terms of Menander. As for the date of the Carystian derived from Athenaeus 14, 664 a, Kaibel holds that the language implies similarity rather than contemporaneousness.

It must be acknowledged that these arguments, if taken at their face value, make a strong case for Kaibel's contention. But I am convinced that they do not bear examination. After all, the only positive argument is that based on the style of the fragments; the rest tend to show no more than the possibility, or, if you please, the probability, of the proposed identification. But can even so expert a critic of style as Kaibel set up such a claim on the basis of the extant remains? Less than ten verses are assigned by Kock[1] to the Geloan, and among them only one complete sentence. Some forty-five verses are given to the Carystian. A large proportion of all the fragments is quoted in illustration of uncommon words. In such a collection it would not be strange if one found a certain uniformity of style, if we can use the word 'style' at all. The third of Kaibel's arguments would have weight if in the passages cited we had any right to demand the names of both Apollodori, with their appropriate designations. On the contrary, the Anonymous writer expressly states that he gives only the *ἀξιολογώτατοι* of the New Comedy. Nobody has claimed such an honor for Apollodorus Gelous. As for the epithet, Philemon is in no way distinguished from the two other comic poets of this name, and yet nobody is deceived. The official lists of victors never distinguish between homonyms. The portion of the Lenaean list to which Kaibel refers could not

[1] Kock's treatment of the two Apollodori is very unsatisfactory. For example, he assigns two fragments of the *Γραμ.* to the Geloan, the third to the Carystian, according as they chanced to be quoted. But even if we transfer the odd fragment to the Geloan, we remove practically the only fragment of which 'style' might be predicated from the remains of the Carystian.

Digitized by Google

have embraced the name of the second Apollodorus, supposing that there was such a person, unless his first victory was won within about 15 years after that of the first of the name. The fact that only one Apollodorus appears in this list is, consequently, of no significance to those who believe that the Carystian was a generation later than the Geloan. The passage of Aulus Gellius runs: comoedias lectitamus nostrorum poetarum sumptas ac uersas de Graecis, Menandro ac Posidippo aut Apollodoro aut Alexidi, et quibusdam item aliis comicis. In such a selection I fail to see why we should expect to find both Apollodori. Nor can an inference, in my opinion, be drawn from the fact that here and in the didascalia to the Phormio there is no attempt to distinguish this Apollodorus from another of the same name. To the Romans there was ordinarily only one Apollodorus, as there was but one Philemon. The learned Life of Terence[1] published by Mai furnishes the only exception.

Nor does Kaibel's answer to the two obvious objections to his theory seem quite convincing. Assume that a poet from Carystus was admitted to citizenship at Athens and was made an honorary citizen of Gela also. He might well be referred to indifferently either as an Athenian or as a Carystian, and possibly as a Geloan by the Geloans; but surely the Athenians, or the ancient writers whose sources were all Athenian, would never have spoken of him as 'the Geloan.'[2] The fact that in such writers we find both epithets in current usage points distinctly to two different indi-

[1] Quattuor e Menandro translatae . . ., duae ex Apollodoro Caricio, Hecyra et Phormio.

[2] If he resided permanently in Athens and had received the citizenship, he would call himself by preference an Athenian, and would be so called officially, but outside of Athens he would generally be designated by his native city. At least this seems to be a safe inference from a number of examples which I have collected. The following instances of comic poets may be cited. The elder Philemon was from Syracuse and is called a Syracusan by Suidas and Anon. *περὶ κωμ.*, and in the inscription CIG., Sic. et Ital. 1221. But in the official inscriptions CIA. II 1289 and III 948 he is given his deme name *Διομειεύς*. So Diodorus from Synope is called *Σινωπεύς* in the Delian inscriptions B. C. H. 2, pp. 104, 106, but on his tombstone, CIA. II 3343, is designated by his deme *Σημαχίδαι*. The comic poet Diomedes, whose statue was set up in the theatre (CIA. III 952), is found in an inscription from Magnesia on the Meander (Ath. Mitth. 19, p. 96) as *Δ. Ἀθηνοδώρου Περγαμηνός*; but in a dedication in his honor found at Epidaurus (*Ἐφ. Ἀρχ.* 1883, p. 27) we have *Δ. Ἀθηνοδώρου Ἀθηναῖος*. In an Athenian inscription CIA. III 769, *Καπίτων* is described as a *ποιητὴς Περγαμηνὸς καὶ Ἀθηναῖος*. Examples could be multiplied.

Digitized by Google

viduals. Finally, let us see how the case really stands regarding the dates which Meineke believed he established. The language of Athenaeus (Μάχων δ' ὁ Σικυώνιος τῶν κατὰ Ἀπολλόδωρον τὸν Καρύστιον κωμῳδοποιῶν εἷς ἐστι καὶ αὐτός), to my thinking, clearly implies that Machon, who was the instructor of Aristophanes of Byzantium in matters pertaining to comedy (Ath. 6, 241 f.), was a contemporary of Apollodorus Carystius. But opinions may differ on this point. But surely the phrase σύγχρονος τοῦ Μενάνδρου is more than an indefinite reference to the time of the New Comedy. Let us see if Diphilus, Lynceus, and Poseidippus, who are also dated by reference to Menander, are really illustrations of Kaibel's contention. For Diphilus we have the testimony of Philemon himself in the words of Tranio, in Plautus, Mostell. 1149 si amicus Deiphilo aut Philemoni's. In the list of victors, frag. *g*, Diphilus is in the third place after Menander and second after Philemon. The language of Anonymous is therefore about as exact and definite as it could be. Lynceus was the brother of the historian Duris and pupil of Theophrastus. He was thus, in fact, Menander's contemporary, and we may accept the other explicit statement of Suidas, that he once defeated his great rival. Poseidippus is said to have exhibited first two years after Menander's death. We can not control this statement to the year, but can show that Suidas was not far wrong, at any rate. Poseidippus undoubtedly won a Lenaean victory. But on frag. *g* of the Lenaean list of victors, which includes eight names after Menander, his name is not found. This represents an interval of about 18 years—the *minimum* of time which may have elapsed between the first victory of Menander, which was not before 321, and the first victory of Poseidippus. When we consider that so precise a notice as this of Suidas probably was based upon the official didascalic records, it would seem that it has been needlessly suspected. I may add that the other notices of this character in Anonymous and in Suidas—that is, those which fix the time of a poet by reference to a contemporary—are found to be surprisingly accurate when tested by what remains of the victors' lists.[1]

After all that has been said to weaken the force of Kaibel's arguments, I should feel that the principal argument for the identification of the Apollodori—that is, the deliberate opinion of this

[1] E.g. Eupolis in Anon., and Theopompus, Plato, Nicophon, and Nicochares in Suidas. Aristophanes, to whom these last-named poets are referred, had a long career, so that σύγχρονος is in his case a sufficiently broad term.

Digitized by Google

distinguished scholar—were still unimpaired, unless we should succeed in producing new evidence on the other side. It must be made clear that the Carystian was of a later date than the Geloan, and that without the aid of the passage in Athenaeus concerning Machon. That there was an Apollodorus *σύγχρονος τοῦ Μενάνδρου* is established by the victors' list, CIA. II 977 *g*—*Μένανδρος, Φιλήμων, Ἀπολλόδωρος, Δίφιλος, Φιλιππίδης, κτέ.* That there was also an Apollodorus in the next generation, a contemporary of Poseidippus, is an equally certain inference, in my opinion, from the list of the principal poets of the New Comedy given by Anonymous: Philemon, Menander, Diphilus, Philippides, Poseidippus, Apollodorus. In its enumeration of the poets of the Old Comedy, this valuable article follows a strictly chronological order. The same holds true of the present enumeration, unless Apollodorus alone forms an exception, for every name after the two first can be checked off against the names in the official victors' list, so far as it goes. Were this list the record of the Dionysia, and not of the Lenaea, the two first would also be found in the order given in Anonymous. I see no way of explaining the position of Apollodorus *after* Poseidippus except by going back to the old belief in Apollodorus of Carystus as distinct from Apollodorus of Gela. The chronological data furnished by the ancients are in harmony in every particular with the order of names here given. Apollodorus of Gela, the contemporary of Menander in the victors' list, has no place in the select list of *ἀξιολογώτατοι* in Anonymous. Completely overshadowed as a poet by the younger man, he well-nigh loses his place in the history of literature as well, for the simple name 'Apollodorus' is understood by everybody to mean the Carystian. To identify these two poets creates difficulties where no contradictions existed before, and does violence to some very explicit and apparently trustworthy statements of the ancients, as well as to the testimony, unconscious and therefore less open to suspicion, of Anonymous *περὶ κωμῳδίας* and the victors' list.

The task of assigning the extant fragments to their right authors is no less difficult than before, but it would be easy to improve upon Kock. In the first place, it is *a priori* probable that every play ascribed to the Geloan belongs to him. The plays of the famous Carystian are less likely to have been ascribed to his less-popular and less-known double. Other considerations support this view in the case of two plays. Wilamowitz has shown (Ind.

Digitized by Google

lect. Gött. 1893/4, p. 14—quoted by Kaibel) that the Γραμματειδιοποιός, which is in the list of Suidas and attributed to the Geloan twice by Pollux, though to the Carystian by Athenaeus, was written before 300. There is also internal evidence for as early a date for the Ἱέρεια, also in the list of Suidas, but referred to the Carystian by Athenaeus. To the younger poet may be assigned, on the other hand, all plays that are quoted by the unqualified name 'Apollodorus,' and also the Ἔκυρα and Ἐπιδικαζόμενος, on the authority of the Vita Terentii.

Cephisodotus and Cephisodorus.—In the Lenaean list of victors, at the foot of the third extant column and in the ninth place before Menander, stands the name [Κηφισόδω]ρος I. Though only three letters remain, the restoration proposed by Köhler may be accepted as certain, giving as it does the name of a well-known comic poet that satisfies perfectly the conditions of space. The date of the single victory of this poet can not be far from 345. Now, the Cephisodorus whom we have known hitherto has been universally assigned to the Old Comedy. A comic poet of this name, according to the vulgate text of Lysias 21, 4, won a victory in the archonship of Euclid. At this time the practice of appointing two men to bear the burdens of the choregia together was followed for the tragic and comic exhibitions at the City Dionysia (Aristotle apud Schol. Arist., Ran. 404). But the speaker in Lysias gives us to understand that he alone met the expenses at the occasion referred to (κωμῳδοῖς χορηγῶν Κηφισοδώρῳ ἐνίκων, καὶ ἀνήλωσα σὺν τῇ σκευῇ ἀναθέσει ἑκκαίδεκα μνᾶς). Hence it is believed that the victory of the poet of 402 was won at the Lenaea.[1] We should accordingly expect to find the name of this poet in col. II of the list before us. But, unfortunately, the last six names in this column are lost. In the corresponding portion of the list of victors at the Dionysia (frag. *k*, 3d l. of col. III), however, we find the name of [Κη]φισο-. Between this name and that of Euphronius in col. I (frag. *i*), 26 or 27 names intervened on the original stone. Since Euphronius won his single victory in 458 (CIA. II 971 f.), the first victory of Κηφισο- was won in the neighborhood of 400. There can be no doubt, therefore, of the identity of this poet and the victor of 402 in Lysias. It is equally certain that the Κηφισόδωρος of col. III is an entirely different

[1] See article on the Synchoregia in Am. Journ. Phil. 17 (1896), p. 322, and Haigh, Attic Theatre[2], p. 75.

Digitized by Google

person. We have therefore a new name to add to our *index poetarum*.

How, then, shall we restore the name in frag. *k*? The manuscripts of Lysias all give Κηφισοδότῳ. This has been changed by common consent with Clinton (Fast. Hell. under year 403/2) to -δώρῳ, for the sake of identifying this poet with the Cephisodorus known from Suidas and over a dozen citations in other authors. But, now that we have found a poet Cephisodorus who is not identical with the poet in Lysias, the original presumption in favor of the change absolutely disappears, and we should unhesitatingly restore the reading of the manuscripts in Lysias and the name [Κη]φισό[δοτος] in the inscription.

But we have still to reckon with Suidas, whose notice is as follows: Κηφισόδωρος Ἀθηναῖος, τραγικὸς τῆς ἀρχαίας τραγῳδίας. ἔστιν αὐτοῦ τῶν δραμάτων Ἀντιλαΐς Ἀμαζόνες Τρωφώνιος Ὑς. The article is clearly corrupt. The titles are all comic, and the necessity of correcting τραγικός and τραγῳδίας to κωμικός and κωμῳδίας is obvious. But even so the Cephisodorus whom we know from frag. *g* of the victors' list did not belong to the Old Comedy, and the poet of the Old Comedy of frag. *k* was not necessarily, as we have seen, Cephisodorus. It may, after all, be necessary to adopt the textual change in Lysias. But there is a simpler way of accounting for the error. Preceding the notice in Suidas which we have quoted is an article on Κηφισόδοτος, a general. If we suppose that in the source or in the original form of Suidas this article was followed by an article on Κηφισόδοτος, κωμικὸς τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμῳδιάς, and this by the present article on Κηφισόδωρος, who was, however, characterized as κωμικὸς τῆς μέσης κωμῳδιάς, nothing could be more natural than that the transcriber's eye passed over the second Κηφισόδοτος to Κηφισόδωρος, then back to the description τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμ., and possibly confounded the titles of the plays of the two poets also. This kind of error is found all through Suidas. As for the confusion of τραγικός and κωμικός, see the examples cited by Meineke in Hist. Crit., pp. 340, 521 sqq.

All of the extant fragments are quoted under the name of Cephisodorus; they should therefore be assigned to the poet of the Middle Comedy. Among the titles of the plays thus quoted are the last three mentioned by Suidas. There is nothing either in the scanty fragments or in the allusions of Athenaeus and Pollux which indicates a date, and the titles are such as we find in the Middle Comedy. On the other hand, the first play men-

Digitized by Google

tioned in Suidas, Ἀντιλαΐς, is never quoted. Meineke (Hist. Crit., pp. 414 and 267) pointed out that the title has reference to Lais, the famous ἑταίρα of the last part of the fifth century and the beginning of the fourth. Epicrates, who flourished in the early part of the fourth century, also wrote a comedy with this title. One might suspect, therefore, that this play at least was produced by Cephisodotus. Its omission from the list of titles in Eudocia (p. 443, Flach), otherwise identical with that in Suidas, may have been due to the textual history of the notice which has been suggested. The indications are too slight, however, for any positive conclusions. In any event, the plays of Cephisodotus were probably not extant at the time of the Alexandrian grammarians.

Aristomenes.—The notice of Suidas is: Ἀριστομένης, Ἀθηναῖος, κωμικὸς τῶν ἐπιδευτέρων τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμῳδίας, οἳ ἦσαν ἐπὶ τῶν Πελοποννησιακῶν, ὀλυμπιάδων πζ'. The dating is consistent with itself, for Phrynichus is also classed among the ἐπιδεύτεροι, and made his first appearance in 431. A poet of this name appears as a competitor of Aristophanes in 387; hence the statement which we find in the Pauly-Wissowa Encyclopädie, that Aristomenes was "durchaus Zeit- und Altersgenossen des Aristophanes."[1] This would give a career of 44 years. Meineke (op. cit., p. 211) thinks this improbable, suggesting that the didascalic notice prefixed to the Plutus is a blending of two such records, one referring to the first production of the Plutus in 408, in which the name of Aristomenes appeared, the other to the second performance. Kock (vol. I, p. 690) quotes this opinion with approval, although he should know—in Meineke's time it was not known—that the presence of five names in the didascalia of the Plutus, as opposed to the three found in earlier notices, is simply an indication that the number of competing plays had been increased from three to five. It must be accepted, then, as an established fact that Aristomenes, or a poet of similar name, competed as late as 387.

The catalogue of Lenaean victors makes it certain that the first appearance of this poet was several years before 431, and that

[1] He is also credited with two victories each at the Dionysia and at the Lenaea. But CIA. II 977 a', which contains the name Aristomenes, can not belong to the list of comic poets. Even if it did, there would be a century between. See my article on these catalogues in the last number of this Journal.

Digitized by Google

this date in Suidas is to be considered rather his acme, or of his first victory at the Dionysia. The name of Aristomenes is in the sixth place above that of Eupolis. We do not know precisely the year of the latter's first Lenaean victory, but it must have been before that of Aristophanes, who was victorious with the Acharnians at the Lenaea of 425. Cratinus died ca. 422, so that his second and third victories must be placed somewhere before that date. Now the year 424 is also occupied by a victory of Aristophanes (Knights). If, then, we suppose that the six poets between Aristophanes and Aristomenes won only once each before 423, and that the predecessors of the latter won no victories in the interval, the latest possible date of the first victory of Aristomenes is 434.[1] Obviously, this calculation leaves too little margin for the extra victories of the earlier poets. Let us take another starting-point, the victory of Cephisodotus in 402. His name must have stood in the second place after Philonicus in col. II. Aristomenes was the twenty-fifth name preceding. We are safe in assuming that before 402 Telecleides had won all of his five victories, Cratinus three, Pherecrates two, Phrynichus probably two, Eupolis three,—occupying in all ten extra years. To these ten we may add two[2] victories for Aristophanes after his first (Eq. in 424, Ran. in 405). Allowing but one victory in this period to the other poets between Aristomenes and Cephisodotus, and none to the predecessors of the former, the first Lenaean victory of Aristomenes is carried back to 439 at the latest, i. e. 25+12+402. When we consider the victories of the predecessors of Aristomenes in this interval, we are certainly safe in placing his first victory not far from 445, to say nothing of his first appearance.

This being so, are we to believe that this Aristomenes is the same poet who competed with Aristophanes in 387? Since there is not a vestige of testimony to the existence of two comic poets

[1] Aristomenes being the seventh name before Aristophanes (425) and Cratinus winning twice in the interval. This assumes that the name of Aristophanes came immediately after Eupolis. I believe that it did, but possibly one or two names intervened.

[2] I omit the possible victory with the Wasps in 423, which rests upon a very uncertain revision of the corrupt didascalic notice. When we consider the large number of poets that must be crowded into the interval between Aristophanes and Cephisodotus, it seems more than ever probable that Philonides was victor in 423 with the Προαγών.

Digitized by Google

of this name, opinions will vary in this matter. Bergk,[1] although he did not know that the difference between the date given by Suidas and that indicated by the inscription was as great as we have shown it to be, concluded that there were two poets, one the contemporary of Cratinus, the other of Aristophanes. A dramatic career of over 60 years is not unexampled on the Attic stage: witness Sophocles, Alexis, and Philemon. Perhaps the strangest thing is that we should have heard so little about a man so remarkable, and that he should have had so little success. The most plausible solution, in my opinion, would be to correct Ἀριστομένης in the hypothesis to the Plutus to Ἀριστώνυμος. The date of the latter would be entirely suitable. The name of Aristomenes is corrupted four times in ancient authors to Aristophanes, and the similarity of names may have led to a similar corruption in the didascalic notice. The comedy Admetus is known only from this notice. It may also be suggested as a possibility that the name of Theopompus, who was the author of a play Admetus, was displaced in some way by that of Aristomenes.

Antiphanes.—The chronology of Antiphanes has always been a perplexing problem. The accepted view is that of Clinton (Phil. Mus. 1, 1832, pp. 607 sqq.), that he was born in the ninety-third Olympiad (408–5), began to exhibit in the ninety-eighth (388–5), and died between 334 and 331. This result is derived from Suidas, who says: γέγονε κατὰ τὴν ϛγ′ ὀλυμπιάδα, and that he died at the age of 74, and from Anonymous II περὶ κωμῳδίας, who reports that he began to exhibit μετὰ τὴν ϛη′ ὀλ. But the further statement of the latter, that Antiphanes was admitted to Athenian citizenship on the proposal of Demosthenes, must be rejected as inconsistent with the other data, and the comedy Παρεκδιδομένη, or at least the fragment quoted by Athenaeus, in which Seleucus is referred to as βασιλεύς, must be attributed to another poet. Perhaps quite the most serious objection to this solution is the word γέγονε in Suidas. Rohde has shown by a most careful analysis of all passages in Suidas in which this word occurs (Rhein. Mus. 33, 1878, pp. 161–220), that, out of 129 instances,

[1] Rhein. Mus. 34, 1879, 292 sqq. Thinking that this inscription was a portion of the Dionysiac catalogue, he had no datable event from which to reckon, for he did not trust the notice of the victory of Ameipsias at the Dionysia of 414.

Digitized by Google

the meaning 'natus est' is certain in only 6, among which he includes the reference to Antiphanes. In the overwhelming majority of cases γέγονε is equivalent to ἤκμαζε. Meineke found the greatest difficulty in the reference to Seleucus, and was disposed to correct οδ' to ρδ' in Suidas, thus prolonging the poet's life to ca. 304. But this proposal, involving a dramatic career of 84 years, has naturally met with no favor.

The Lenaean list of victors, unfortunately, does not furnish us with new facts of a sufficiently definite character to settle, once for all, the difficulties which have been pointed out. After the victory of Cephisodotus in 402 we know of only one Lenaean victory, that of Philemon in 306, which was not his first victory. We shall, consequently, have no absolutely certain point of departure, but shall be obliged to employ chronological data of a more general character. Our results will of necessity be only approximate and relative; and yet they may at least indicate roughly the position which Antiphanes held in relation to his contemporaries among the comic poets, and thus point to the true source of the contradictions in our evidence.

We have information about two of the contemporaries of Antiphanes—Anaxandrides and Eubulus. The first City victory of the former was won in 376, according to the Parian Chronicle.[1] The strange statement of Suidas: γεγονὼς ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσι Φιλίππου τοῦ Μακεδόνος, ὀλ. ρα', is at least not at variance with the Chronicle. Eubulus, according to Suidas, flourished in the 101st Olympiad, 376–3. These data have reference, no doubt, to the Dionysia, so that it is quite possible that both Anaxandrides and Eubulus were successful at the Lenaea before 376. Now in the Lenaean list we find these names: Anaxandrides, Philetaerus, Eubulus, Ephippus, Antiphanes. The position of the names of Anaxandrides and Eubulus close to each other is in harmony with the evidence which we have just examined. But if Antiphanes began to exhibit as early as 388–5, it is surprising that we should find his name in the list four lines after that of Anaxandrides. We may

[1] L. 82: ἀφ' οὗ Ἀναξανδρίδης ὁ κωμ[ῳδοποιὸς πρῶτον ἐνίκησεν, ἔτη ΠΔΙΙΙ, ἄρχοντος] Ἀθήνησιν Καλλέου. There can be no doubt that this is the correct restoration. Bergk, Litt. Gesch. IV, p. 158, insisted that this must be a dithyrambic victory, relying on his interpretation of CIG., Sic. et Ital. 1098, and pointing to the fact that the Chronicle never refers to comic victories. The newly discovered fragment corrects this assumption. His interpretation of the didascalic inscription can not be defended. The epithet κωμῳδοποιός is decisive.

Digitized by Google

estimate the discrepancy at from 15 to 20 years. It is of course possible that, for some reason, his first success at the Lenaea was delayed this long. One might refer to the case of Cratinus, who seems to have won a victory at the Dionysia about 10 years before he was successful at the Lenaea, and to Philemon, whose first Lenaean victory was some seven years after his first City victory. And yet both Cratinus and Philemon seem to have reserved their strength for the City Dionysia, at which they won a large majority of their victories. Antiphanes, on the other hand, won 8 of his 13 victories at the Lenaea, whereas Anaxandrides was victorious only three times at the Lenaea, but seven times at the Dionysia. Thus every consideration seems to point to a later date for the first appearance of Antiphanes than that given by Anonymous.

We reach the same general result by another method, keeping entirely to our list of victors. Between the victory of Cephisodotus in 402 and that of Menander, which can scarcely have been later than 321, is an interval of 81 years. Our catalogues gave the names of 28 poets in this period. Some of the victories after 402 were undoubtedly won by predecessors of Cephisodotus. We may estimate the number at 10,[1] leaving 71 victories, or an average of about 2½ victories for each poet. Assuming that this average was constant, the first victory of Antiphanes would fall in the year 367. This result tallies with that which we have already obtained. Anonymous places the date of Antiphanes' entrance upon his dramatic career about 20 years too high.

There is no trustworthy indication of a date anterior to 367 in the extant fragments.[2] Meineke thought that the Ἄντεια, in which the perfumer Pero was mentioned, should be dated ca. 376, for this person was mentioned also in the Admetus of Theopompus, produced in 387, and in a play of Anaxandrides of uncertain date. For a similar reason he placed the Ὀμφάλη in the same period, because the baker Theario, whom Aristophanes mentioned in two

[1] This seems liberal enough, considering the small number of victories assigned to the immediate predecessors of Cephisodotus. The result which we shall reach, however, would not be affected at all if a lower or higher estimate were adopted.

[2] The earliest play that can be dated positively has been thought to be the Ἀνασῳζόμενοι, on the strength of CIA. II 972. But I have shown elsewhere that the archon Diotimus of this inscription was the magistrate of 289/8, and not of 354/3, as Boeckh and Koehler thought. See Am. Jour. Arch., vol. IV, No. 1.

Digitized by Google

of his later plays, is referred to. But no reliance can be placed in such evidence.[1] On the other hand, the Κιθαριστής must have been produced after the defeat of Agis by Antipater in 330, and the Δίδυμοι still later, if frag. 81 is to receive a natural interpretation. Quite apart, therefore, from the Παρεκδιδομένη, to which we shall return, there is good reason for believing that Antiphanes can not have died as early as 331. We are accordingly bound to follow up the indications, which we have found in the catalogue of victors, of a date later than that furnished by Anonymous, and to seek an explanation of the error in the tradition.

In the first place, we should give the word γέγονε in Suidas its usual and proper meaning of 'floruit,' and adopt Bernhardy's[2] correction of ϛγ′ to ργ′ (368–5). The *floruit* of the dramatic poets was readily fixed by the ancients by reference to the pinacographical material and official documents which formed the basis of Aristotle's Διδασκαλίαι and Νῖκαι Διονυσιακαὶ καὶ Ληναϊκαί. The peripatetics studied these sources diligently. The valuable article of Anonymous II περὶ κωμῳδίας is largely compiled from such documents. It is significant that in it the vague γέγονε occurs only once, and that in the notice on Epicharmus, concerning whom no didascalic information was available. Elsewhere we find the more definite νικᾷ or πρῶτον ἐδίδαξε. The same holds true of the Parian Chronicle. Now there can be no doubt that γέγονε and ἦν in Suidas, as well as the ἐγνωρίζετο of the chronographers, were but a convenient equivalent of πρῶτον ἐδίδαξε or ἐνίκα. γέγονε then designated not the real acme, but what Kaibel terms the "half acme." From this as a starting-point it was easy for the ancient biographer to arrive at an approximate date for the birth of the poet, assisted often, no doubt, by allusions in his earlier dramas; for the birth-date was of course not a matter of record.[3] The accounts of Anonymous and Suidas go back, therefore, to a common source, and, where they give information on the same point, should be in agreement. If the correct form of the state-

[1] We do not know how long Pero lived. As for Theario, the allusion in the Ὀμφάλη (frag. 176, K.) would be just as much in point if the baker had been dead for years.

[2] Bernhardy, however, took γέγονε to mean 'natus est.'

[3] See Kaibel on Menander, in CIG., Sic. et Ital. 1184, and in his notices on the comic poets in Pauly-Wissowa. The statements about the youth of Eupolis and Menander at their first exhibitions were probably derived from their plays.

Digitized by Google

ment in Suidas was *γέγονε κατὰ τὴν ργ' ὀλ.*, the parallel statement in Anonymous was originally *ἤρξατο διδάσκειν κατὰ τὴν ργ' ὀλ.*

The notice as it now stands in Anonymous is as follows: *Ἀντιφάνης μὲν οὖν Στεφάνου Ἀθηναῖος* (*lacuna*) *καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν μετὰ* (*κατὰ* Mein.) *τὴν ϛη' ὀλυμπιάδα. καὶ φασὶν αὐτὸν γενέσθαι μὲν τῶν ἀπὸ Θεσσαλίας ἐκ Λαρίσσης, παρεγγραφῆναι δὲ εἰς τὴν Ἀθηναίων πολιτείαν ὑπὸ Δημοσθένους, κτέ.* Kaibel points out the lacuna before *καί*. It seems to me probable that the lost sentence gave the date of the poet's birth and read: *Ἀντιφάνης . . . . . ἐγενήθη ἐπὶ τῆς ϛη' ὀλυμπιάδος καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν κατὰ τὴν ργ' ὀλ. κτέ.* If the original notice was in this form, it is easy to see how both the lacuna and the false date of the first appearance had their origin, and also how the corruption in Suidas arose.

Without going into the difficult question about the poet's birthplace, we now learn that the statement that Demosthenes made the proposal granting Athenian citizenship is chronologically quite possible. The date of his death may now be placed as late as 310. But the *Παρεκδιδομένη*, as we have seen, is generally placed after 307/6, on the authority of Diodorus 20, 53, who states that the title of *βασιλεύς* was not officially assumed by Seleucus until after it had been adopted by Antigonus. We know, however, that this title and its dignities were commonly bestowed upon this king by his subjects some time before they had been officially adopted for foreign intercourse.[1] There is no reason why the phrase *τὴν Σελεύκου τοῦ βασιλέως ὑπεροχήν* (frag. 187, K.) should not have been employed by a comic poet to indicate the actual position of the ruler without regard to diplomatic usage. We are accordingly no longer obliged to suppose that Athenaeus wrongly attributed this play to Antiphanes or that the present text of the quotation is due to a later edition of the play. If Antiphanes was born in Ol. 98 (388–5), first exhibited in Ol. 103 (368–5), and died at the age of 74 years between 314/3 and 311/0, the internal evidence of the extant fragments is fully satisfied, the chronological data supplied by the list of victors and the Parian Chronicle are given their due weight, and the present text of Suidas and Anonymous, universally admitted to be corrupt, receives a satisfactory explanation.

[1] Droysen, Gesch. des Hellenismus, II 2, p. 141: "Bisher schon war Seleukos von den Barbaren König genannt und in morgenländischen Weise begrüsst worden."

Digitized by Google

Alexis.—Any new light on the life of Alexis, the greatest of the poets of the Middle Comedy, is peculiarly welcome. The notice which was once in Anonymous is now lost, and Suidas gives no chronological data. A victory at the Dionysia of 347 is recorded in CIA. II 971 *g*. The Ἀγκυλίων must have been produced before this time, for the verses preserved by Diogenes refer to Plato as still alive. The Ἀποβάτης was one of his earliest plays. On account of the reference to the poet Argas (fr. 19), who is mentioned also by Anaxandrides, Kock concludes that it was written ca. 368, but Kaibel is clearly right in objecting to this conclusion.[1] We are certainly safe in saying that none of the plays of which we have fragments need have been written before 350. On the other hand, a *terminus post quem* for his death is furnished by the fragment of the Ὑποβολιμαῖος, in which the poet refers to Arsinoe, the sister-wife of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and to the treaty between Athens, Sparta, and Egypt whereby peace was re-established. The second marriage of Ptolemy was contracted before 273, and the treaty concluded somewhere between 271 and 265.[2] Kaibel accordingly dates this play ca. 270.[3] If Plutarch, Script. Mor. 420 *d*, is interpreted literally, Alexis lived to be 106 years old. The date of his birth may accordingly be placed as early as 376.

In the Lenaean list of victors the name of Alexis is four lines after that of Antiphanes, who, as we have seen, did not begin to exhibit until about 367. Accordingly, the first Lenaean victory of Alexis may be placed about ten years later. This date, which of course can be considered only an approximation, is entirely in harmony with the known facts of his life as indicated above, and confirms the view of Kaibel that the date of the poet's birth as established by Meineke is much too early. Doubt may still be felt as to the authorship of the present version of the Ὑποβολιμαῖος, but at any rate it is possible that it was written by the centenarian. The Ἀνθίδες was in all probability produced as late as 275, as I have tried to prove on the strength of CIA. II 975 *h* (Am. Jour. Arch. IV 1).

[1] See article in Pauly-Wissowa. Kock refers to Meineke, who, however, merely places the floruit of Argas ca. 368.

[2] Köhler on CIA. II 332. On the marriage see Mahaffy, Empire of the Ptolemies, p. 138.

[3] Bergk, Rhein. Mus. 35, p. 259, contends that the present text is due to a second edition of the play. But, as Kaibel has shown, the date of the poet's birth has been placed too early by Meineke (i. e. ca. 291). See Hist. Crit., p. 376.

Digitized by Google

The fact that Alexis was active as a playwright ca. 357 suggests an interesting coincidence, which, I trust, may be found to be not without some claims to probability. In the Parian Chronicle, 90–91, after an extensive lacuna, are the words: *ἐνίκησεν, ἔτη* ΓΔΔΔΙΙΙ, *ἄρχοντος Ἀθήνησιν Ἀγαθοκλέ[ους]*, i. e. in the year 357/6. The reference undoubtedly was to the first victory of some poet at the Dionysia. Now what poet could this be but Alexis? We know certainly of no tragic poet of prominence whose success in 356 could be thus signalled. Of the comic poets, Anaxandrides' first victory has already been mentioned, and that of Antiphanes was doubtless about a decade earlier. Of the other poets of the Middle Comedy, none but Alexis was of sufficient prominence to have been selected by the compiler of the Chronicle for special mention, which is accorded, apparently, to none of the poets of the New Comedy except Philemon and Menander. It is of course possible that the poet was a dithyrambic poet; but against this suggestion is to be urged the distinguished position which Alexis held in Athens during an exceptionally long career. I would accordingly propose the following restoration: [. . . . . *καὶ Ἄλεξις ὁ κωμοιδοποιὸς*[1] *τότε πρῶτον*] *ἐνίκησεν.*

Menander.—In his commentary on the newly discovered fragment of the Parian Chronicle (Ath. Mitth. 22, 1897, p. 200), Wilhelm calls attention to the significant fact that Menander precedes Philemon in the catalogue of victors, but he offers no explanation. As our study of the victors' catalogues has shown, the explanation is simply this: the catalogue which we possess is the Lenaean list, whereas the ancient authorities who place Philemon before Menander take into account only the events of the City Dionysia. We can not, however, place the first Lenaean victory of Menander before 321, because the date of his birth[2] is given by CIG., Sic. et Ital. 1182, as 342/1; nor much later, because it is unlikely that the first Lenaean victory of Philemon was gained more than six or seven years after his first City victory in 327. As regards the contradiction in the ancient notices concerning the date of the first City victory of Menander, Wilhelm rightly says that it was due to the confusion of two separate events—his first appearance in 321, in the archonship of Philocles, and his first victory in 315, under Democleides. I

[1] For the spelling cf. the new fragment of the Chronicle.

[2] Although this may be, as Kaibel believes, only the result of an estimate on the basis of the date of his first appearance.

Digitized by Google

think that the amalgamation of the two notices can be traced to its origin.

The chronographers mention the first competition of only one other dramatic poet. Under Ol. 77^3 the Armenian Version of Eusebius says: Sophocles . . . primum apparuit (Sync.: *πρῶτος ἐπεδείξατο*, Hieron.: primum . . . opera publicauit). Then under Ol. 78^1 the first victory of the same poet is indicated by the word cognoscebatur (Hieron.: clarus habetur).[1] As regards Menander, Hieronymus gives under Ol. 114^4: Menander primam fabulam cognomento Orgen docens superat.[2] The language of Syncellus is: *πρῶτον δρᾶμα διδάξας ἐνίκα*. Now just as the notice of Sophocles' first appearance is followed by another recording his first victory (unless we accept Plutarch's statement that Sophocles won at his first competition), so we should naturally expect to find in the chronographers under Ol. 116^2 (316/5) a reference to Menander's first victory. In fact, there seems to be a trace of such a notice in Eusebius, though only a trace. The Armenian Version contains this: Menander et Speusippus philosophi cognoscebantur. In Hieronymus, under the same date, we find: Menedemus et Speusippus filosofi insignes habentur, and similar in Syncellus. Before we had the testimony of the Parian Chronicle to a victory of Menander in 315, it was natural to regard the word *Menander* in Eusebius as a corruption of *Menedemus*. It will now, however, seem more probable that Menander belongs here, the rest of the sentence being lost. I believe that the combination of the two notices can most readily be explained if we assume that the second notice ran thus: *Μένανδρος <κωμικὸς πρῶτον, δρᾶμα διδάξας Ὀργήν, ἐνίκα, καὶ Μενέδημος> καὶ Σπεύσιππος οἱ φιλόσοφοι ἐγνωρίζοντο*. The preceding notice employed the words *πρῶτον ἐδίδαξε*. Now the first person who falsely construed *πρῶτον* with *δρᾶμα* (cf. Hieron.: primam fabulam) or with *διδάξας* would be tempted at once to substitute the second notice for the first. For this reason I think it more probable that the *Ὀργή* was produced in 315 than, with Wilhelm, in 321.

EDWARD CAPPS.

[1] Euripides is wrongly included in the notice. The date should be 77^4 (469/8) instead of 78^1, for Aeschylus won in this year. Plutarch, Cim. 8, makes Sophocles victorious at his first competition in 468. According to the Parian Chronicle he was 28 years old in 468, so that there is nothing improbable, at least, in the notice of Eusebius.

[2] Curiously corrupt in the Vers. Arm.: Iêandrus primus uirtutem ostendit, superabat enim *òργήν* (iracundiam).

Digitized by Google

IV.—THE WENZELBIBEL, COD. PAL. VINDOB. 2759–2764.

This, the most famous MS of the group called by Walther[1] "2. Zweig," comprises only the Old Testament, and that not quite complete. The MS is of parchment, and consists at present of six large folio volumes. A somewhat reduced facsimile of a page of the first volume is given by Walther opposite col. 296. The first volume contains the five books of Moses, and Joshua; the second, Judges, Ruth, and the four books of Kings; the third, Chronicles, Manasseh's Prayer, first to third Ezra, Tobias, and the first seven verses of Judith; the fourth, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Judith, Esther, Job, and the Latin introduction to the Psalms; the fifth, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Solomon's Song, Wisdom of S., Ecclesiasticus and Prayer of S.; the sixth, Isaiah, Jeremiah (without Lamentations), Baruch, Ezekiel. The MS is written in large Gothic letters. The literature is given by Walther, col. 291.

The material for the present paper was obtained in Vienna in the summer of 1898. Having occasion to examine the MS for the purposes of another investigation, I noticed that the MS had not as yet been accurately described as regards scribes and dialects, and therefore made notes and extracts which form the basis of this article. Recently, a book by F. Jelinek[2] has appeared, in which a considerable portion of my work has been anticipated. Jelinek first describes the MS and the scribes, points out certain errors of translation, and prints the prologue. He then discusses in order the various vowels and consonants, declension, conjugation, and certain syntactical phenomena. At

[1] Die deutsche Bibelübersetzung des Mittelalters, dargestellt von Wilh. Walther. Braunschweig, 1889–92.

[2] Die Sprache der Wenzelsbibel in ihrem Verhältnis zu der Sprache der wichtigsten deutschen Literatur- und Rechtsdenkmäler aus Böhmen und Mähren im XIV. Jahrhundert und der kaiserlichen Kanzlei der Luxemburger. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der neuhochdeutschen Schriftsprache von Dr. Franz Jelinek. Görz, 1899. Selbstverlag des Verfassers. Pp. 110. Dr. Göldlin von Tiefenau, Kustos of the Imperial library, who has most kindly given me additional information on doubtful points, also first informed me of the appearance of the above article.

Digitized by Google

the same time comparisons are made with various Bohemian texts of the fourteenth century. Finally, the various dialectic phenomena are summed up, and the author concludes that the translation originated at the end of the fourteenth century, in the region to the north or northwest of Prague.

In so far as the above paper has anticipated the present one, the treatment will be very brief; other questions will be treated more in detail.

Four scribes contributed to the work, who change about fifteen times. The first scribe wrote the first two volumes, and 6 ff. of the third (Gen. to Paral. 4. 38). The text is decidedly Middle German, though the long vowels are generally diphthongized. The pronoun *er* often appears as *her*, the earliest place noted being Gen. 18. 19, in the first volume. This writing becomes more and more frequent in the course of the first and second vols., extending into the third. Jelinek, p. 72, cites instances only from the third volume. M.H.G. *û* generally appears as *ou*, most frequently in the words *ous*, *ouf*. This scribe never writes *aus*, *auf*, in this early portion at least. Sometimes even the undiphthongized vowel appears, as in *cziten*, *fruntschaft*, and still oftener in *us*, *uf*, though in the beginning this is rare. The old diphthong *ou* generally appears as *ou*, though later *au* appears. Flexional *i* is frequent; *ver-* uniformly appears as *vor-*; "rückumlaut" preterites are very frequent; *ie* often appears as *i*; the suffix *-lich* appears as such; the diphthong of *î*, as also the old diphthong *ei*, are written *ei*.

This scribe continues to vol. 3, f. 6^{verso}. Fol. 7^{recto} begins (I Paral. 4. 38): | -ret gross*leich* uñ sie ingiengen in gadar uncz zu dem *au*ſgangk des tals.[1] This is by a Bavarian scribe (2), forms such as *tail*, *waid*, *aus*, *hawser*, *tragund*, *pergk*, *schoffen* (*ovibus*) *gewant* (= *o*), occurring on this page. The writing is larger, the ink blacker, illustrations and superscriptions are lacking, while they do occur on the pages immediately preceding and following. Fol. 7^{verso} is blank, with the exception of one line. F. 7^{recto} ends (I Paral. 5. 18): pogen zu dem streitt | and the verso contains: | vier und vierczigk t*au*sendt. On f. 8^{recto} the first scribe sets in again, the line on f. 7^{v}· being repeated thus: vier und vierczik t*ou*sentt und siben hundert und vierczik czihende

[1] I quote the text and places according to the Vulgate, where the various changes occur, as these are not given by Jelinek. Indeed the whole matter of the scribes is disposed of by him in less than a page.

Digitized by Google

zu streite. This repetition, which occurs at almost every change of scribes, generally gives an indication of the change of dialect, cf. t*au*sendt : t*ou*sentt. Sometimes only one word is repeated; at others, nearly a whole sentence. The reason for this varying repetition is not yet entirely clear to me: Jelinek does not note these repetitions at all.

It is evident that fol. 7 was inserted later by the Bavarian scribe (2), who supplied a gap left by scribe 1. The omission by scribe 1 probably came about as follows:—Up to 4. 38, where the break occurs, the text consists entirely of an enumeration of the various families. With the next verse the narrative sets in, continuing to the end of the chapter. In the following chapter the enumeration of the families begins again, and continues to verse 18, where the narrative begins again. The scribe probably made a pause, and on commencing again found the place where the enumeration of the families ends, but in the fifth chapter, instead of the fourth. Jelinek assumes, p. 4, bot., that, along with others, this leaf had been lost and then replaced by the Bavarian scribe. If this were the case, we should expect both sides of the new leaf to be filled, and more than filled, for the writing on the new leaf is larger than that of scribe 1.

The first scribe, who sets in again f. $8^{r\cdot}$, continues to the end of f. $128^{v\cdot}$: Und hast uns gegeben ein solich wurtzen || (III Esdras 8. 88). On f. $129^{r\cdot}$ the Bavarian scribe (2) sets in again: | sol*ei*che wurczn̄ und haben wider umbgekert ... Characteristic forms such as *vermischt*, *unraynigkait*, *aus*, *auf*, *junkchfrawn*, *waynund*, *weliben* (= *b*) (col. 1, l. 14), *nymbar* (= *w*) (l. 16), occur on this page; on f. 130: *pischolf*, *puech*, *grosleich*. (For *pischolf* cf. Weinhold, Bair. Gram., §159.) This Bavarian scribe (2) continues to the end of f. $136^{v\cdot}$: chert auch gesunnter herwider zw uns und deine augenn | (= Tobias 5. 26). On f. $137^{r\cdot}$ the Middle German scribe (1) sets in again: | ougen werden yn sehen wene ich geloube ...

This change of scribes helps to solve a question concerning the translation itself. Jelinek, it may be noted, does not mention the existence of any related MSS, whereas at least eleven exist; cf. Walther, col. 291. One of these, cgm. 341, may possibly be older than the Wenzelbibel. At all events, the other MSS do not descend from the Wb., but from some other MS now lost. This will be shown conclusively later on. In spite of these MSS Jelinek treats the Wb. as if it were a unique, original translation,

Digitized by Google

and merely refers to a "Concept," which in all the wanderings and vicissitudes of the MS remained with it, so that later, lost portions could be replaced by the Bavarian scribes! On p. 12 he asserts rather naively that a comparison with the second pre-Lutheran printed Bible proves this to be a different translation. It is thus evident that he is entirely ignorant of the work of Walther, who proved this fact nearly ten years ago.

In the matter of the text and scribes of the Wb., Walther, to be sure, is not very successful. In the first place, he fails to note the presence of the third book of Esdras, which in the MS continues the second book (Nehemiah) without a break or change in the superscriptions; at the end, f. 131$^{v\cdot}$, the scribe wrote: "alhie endt sich das ander puech Esdras," which, no doubt, also misled Walther. This confusion probably existed very early in the translation, and was not brought about by the scribe of the Wb., for the Maihingen MS to be quoted later also shares this confusion. Walther therefore states, col. 306: "Wunderbarerweise bietet die Wenzelbibel im Buche Tobias eine durchaus andere Uebersetzung als die übrigen Handschriften. Wir haben diese Partie von dem 2. Uebersetzungskreise auszuschliessen, und werden sie später als den fünften Zweig behandeln." Later, cols. 348–350, he treats the book of Tobias under the heading "5. Zweig."

Walther is unable to determine where this new translation has its beginning and end. During my stay in Vienna I was also unable to determine this, not being able to compare with the texts of the other MSS. Later, on comparing extracts from the Maihingen MS, from Tobias 8. 3–10, and 11. 3, which I had made for other purposes, I found that in these passages the Wb. agreed with the text of Maihingen and the rest, so that the return to the old translation in the Wb. must have taken place before this. The Bavarian scribe, as before noted, had stopped at f. 136$^{v\cdot}$ = Tobias 5. 26, and I therefore suspected that the "5. Zweig" of Walther ended with this scribe, and probably also began with the same, III Esdras 8. 88. Dr. Göldlin v. Tiefenau kindly sent me a copy of the last lines of f. 128$^{v\cdot}$, and Dr. G. Grupp at Maihingen copied the corresponding portions of the Maihingen MS III D. 1, fol. 1, which belongs to the same group, but contains the uniform translation of Walther's "2. Zweig." A comparison of the two texts proved my conjecture to be correct. To the bottom of f. 128$^{v\cdot}$ of the Wb. the two MSS agree almost letter for letter,

Digitized by Google

whereas from f. 129r· they are entirely different, as a glance at the annexed texts will show. This difference continues to f. 136v· incl. of the Wb., = Tobias 5. 26, and on the following page they again agree exactly. The new translation was therefore inserted by the Bavarian scribe (2), and extends from III Esdras 8. 88 to Tobias 5. 26, exactly 8 pp., a signature.

Cod. Pal. Vind. 2761, f°· 128v·, col. 2, ll. 23–36.
(III Esdras 8. 85 seqq.)

..... Und nu ewer töch
ter nicht fuget zŭ iren Sunē
Und ire tochter nemet nicht
ewern sunen. Und sŭchet
nicht vride zu haben mit
yn alle czeit. so das oberwī-
dende esset die guten der
erden. Und teilet das erbe
ewern sunen untz bis ewi
clich. Und was euch wider
vert | das geschicht alles
durch ewer posen werk un
durch ewer grosen sunde.
Und hast uns gegeben ein
apponatur: solich wurtzen
(End of f°· 128v·.)

f°· 129recto, col. 1, l. 1.

soleiche wurczn̄ und ha
ben wider umbgekert ze
ŭbertreten dein saczung
das wir uns vermŭscht
würden der unraÿnnig
kait des auserlendischen
volkchs des daygen lan
dts wirst du dann herr ich-
czürnen uns. und uns ze
uerderben. Als langk daz
nicht beleib unser wurczn̄
und nam. Herr got israhl'
der du warhaftig pist. wen̄
weliben ist dy warhaft
wurczn̄ ŭnczt auf den hew
ttigen tag. Nÿmbar yeczŭt
seȳ wir in unsern poszhait
ten vor deinem angesicht.
etc.

Maikingen MS III D. 1, fol. 1.

Und nu ewer toch-
ter nit fuget zu iren sunen
und ir tochter nemet nicht
ewern sunen und suchet
nit fryde zu haben mit
yn alezit so das uberwin-
dende esset dy guten der
erden und teylet das erbe
ewern sunen uncz bis ewi-
glichen und was euch wider-
veret das geschicht alles
durch ewer pose wergk und
dorch ewer gross sunde
und hast uns geben ein
semlich wurtzeln

und aber
wider sein wir wider gekart zu
ubertreten dein elichen werk
so das wir uns vormischten
der unreynigkeit fremder
heyden diser
erden.
nicht zurne uns
vorliesend uns uncz bis
nicht gelassen werd
unser czweigk und
unser nam. Herre got
warhafft bistu: wen
verlassen ist der
czweig bis in desen
heutigen tagk. Sich nu
seyn wir in unsern sünden
in diner angesicht.
etc.

Digitized by Google

Cod. Pal. Vind. 2761, f°. 136^{verso}, col. 2, l. 3 to end of page. (Tobias 5. 23 seqq.)

.. Und do sy nw fertig warn
do hueb an sein muter ze way
nen und sprechen zum vater
Nw hast du genomen dein
aufhaltung den stab unsers
alters und hast yn gesantt
von uns. Nymmer mer solt
sein das selbig gelt. Darumb
du yn gesantt hast. Genuegt
hyet vns vnser armut das wirs
geschäczt hiettē fur reichtumb
So wir angesehē hiettē unsern
sun. Do sprach zu yr Thobias
Du scholt nicht waynenn
unser Sun chumbt gesunt
ter do hynn Und chert au
ch gesunntter herwider zw
uns und deine augenn

(End of f°. 136^{verso}.)

Maihingen MS III D. 1, fol. 1.

.. und do sy hin geczogen waren
do begonde sein muter weynen
und sprechen den stap unsers
alters hastu
genūmen
und hast yn gesant
von uns das nicht were
das gelt nach dem
du yn gesant hast wen genuget
hett uns unser armūt und
als den reichtūme hetten wir ge-
achtet das das wir hetten gesehen un-
sūne Und thobias sprach zu ir [sern
nicht wein
gesunt kumpt unss sune
herwider
zu uns
und deyn augen

f°. 137^{recto}, col. 1, l. 1, etc.

ougen werden yn sehen. wē
ne ich geloube das der gute
engel gotes wander mit im
und schicke wol alle dink di
pei im werden gehandelt al
so das . . . etc.

werden in sehen und
ich glaub das der gut
engel gotes mit ym wander
und schicke wol alle dingk dy
by ym werden gehandelt al-
so das . . . etc.

Of this new translation III Esdras 8. 88–Tobias 5. 26 there are no further traces. To assume with Jelinek, pp. 4, 5, that this portion had been lost from the MS and replaced by the Bavarian scribe (2) is not possible, for the new scribe would not at all have been able in that case to gauge his work so as to fill exactly eight pages. We must assume that this portion was written before that which follows.

The Middle German scribe (1), who sets in again here, on f. 137^{r}, continues to the end of vol. 3, f. 144. This is another signature of 8 pp., and contains the rest of Tobias and seven verses of Judith. Thus far the order of the books has been that of the Vulgate; but the fourth volume, instead of continuing Judith, begins with Isaiah. This is the work of the Bavarian

Digitized by Google

scribe again, who continues to f. 10v·, only one-fourth of the verso being filled. In this section there are no illustrations. The first col. of f. 10v· ends, about half-way down the page: wirt sy fressen und enczunt *wirt in der dikche des waldes* (Isaiah 9. 18). The italicized words are by a later hand. The second column is blank, with the exception of the line at the bottom: wirt id' dikche. These are the work of the Bavarian scribe (2), and continue the sentence from *enczunt*. A later reviser inserted the same words above, immediately after *enczunt*. This later reviser was also a Bavarian, to judge from the form *dikche*.

On f. 11r· another scribe commences: wirt si in der dicke des waldes und vorwandelt wirt si mit einander. This scribe (3) is also Middle German, but different from (1), who consistently wrote *ous*, *ouf*, and sometimes *us*, *uf*, but never *au*, *aw*; this scribe (3) generally writes *us*, *uf*, sometimes *au*, but never *ou*, the most common form of (1). Other differences between these two scribes will be noted later. Scribe 3 has a strong admixture of Bavarian forms, such as *guldeiner*, *bawern*, *schawen*, *haus*, *mawer*; old *û* generally appears as *au*, *aw*, except in the words *us*, *uf*. This scribe continues through the "*gepete ieremie*," to f. 146r·, of which only one-third of a column is filled. The verso is blank. F. 147r· is also blank. With f. 147v·, at the top, another scribe (4), Bavarian, commences: Hie hebt sich an das buch das do heisset Judith mit semelichen worten. The page ends, Judith 1. 7: und sein hercze wart. | This scribe has *ai*, *ue*, *au*, even in *aus*, *auf*, which latter writing distinguishes him from both the Middle German scribes, while the absence of further Bavarian characteristics distinguishes him from the Bavarian scribe 2.

On f. 148r· the Middle German scribe 1 sets in again, Judith 1. 7: wart erhaben. Here we have as a rule *ous*, *tousent*, but also *aus*, *tausent*. It is the same scribe 1, but the instances of *au* are more frequent.

The mixed state of affairs in the first part of vol. 4 is to be explained as follows: Vol. 3, it will be remembered, ended with Judith 1. 7, scribe 1, and f. 148 of vol. 4 forms the proper continuation of this, by the same scribe. By mistake the portion written by scribe 3, vol. 4, ff. 11–146, was inserted. Then the Bavarian scribe 2 added ff. 1–10 of vol. 4, in order to have Isaiah complete. Later, the Bavarian scribe 4 inserted f. 147, in order to have Judith complete. He copied this from vol. 3, f. 144, which had been written by the Middle German scribe 1, and this

Digitized by Google

probably accounts for the absence of further Bavarian characteristics, as the passage was not extended enough to enable him to get into the swing of his own dialect. That f. 147, and also ff. 1–10, of vol. 4 were inserted later, is shown by the fact that three-fourths of f. 10^{v}, as well as the whole of 147^{r}, are blank.

The Middle German scribe 1 continues from f. 148 to the end of vol. 4, f. 211. Volume 5, beginning with the Psalter, to f. 186 incl. is also the work of this scribe, though his language contains more Bavarian elements. At the beginning of vol. 5, before the Psalter, is a table of contents, beginning: "In dem gegen*b*urtigen puech sind vermerkt die hernachgeben puecher . . ."; and the date, 1447. Dr. Göldlin von Tiefenau considers it possible that the scribe of this table of contents is the same as the one on f. 147, vol. 4, while Jelinek considers it almost certain that they are identical.

The Middle German scribe 1 continues to Ecclesiasticus 34. 24: angesichte des vaters. | On f. 187^{r}, vol. 5, the Bavarian scribe 2 sets in: | das prat der durstigen ist ein leben des armen . . . In this portion characteristic Bavarian forms occur, such as *dew* (= *die*), *gesuechet*, *chain*, *gedenkch*, *andrew*, *erwekch*, *schikch*, *gefolkleich*, *froleich*, *gebund*, *werich*, *verpirig*, *widerbertig* (= *w*), *weyroch*.

This scribe continues to the bottom of f. 192^{v}: si werdent wirtschefften in seine gepoten und | On f. 193^{r} the Middle German scribe 1 sets in again, Ecclesiasticus 39. 37: | werden sie wirtscheften und ouf der erden in der notdurft werden sie bereitet . . . This scribe continues through vol. 5, into vol. 6. Through some mistake the rubric at the end of Ecclesiasticus reads *genant ist sprichworter*. Vol. 6 begins with Isaiah, this time in the correct order of the Vulgate. Here the diphthong of *û* is generally written *au*, except in the words *ous*, *ouf*. Scribe 1 continues to the end of f. 123^{v}: von den steten iuda | (= Jerem. 34. 7). On the next leaf the Bavarian scribe 2 sets in again: | juda gemawrte stete das wort das do wart . . . This scribe continues to the bottom of f. 130^{v}, = Jerem. 40. 1: gefuert wurde gegen Babilon und das |. On the next leaf the Middle German scribe 1 sets in again: | babilon und das haus . . . He continues to the bottom of 138^{v}, = Jerem. 46. 2: den do |. On the next leaf the Bavarian scribe 2 sets in: | den do slueg nabuchodonasor kunig von babilō in dem virden iare . . . In this section are a number of instances of *vor*liesen, and other words with *vor-*, whereas in

Digitized by Google

other places this scribe generally uses the form *ver-*. The *vor-* must be from the Middle German original. The scribe continues to f. 152$^{v\cdot}$, = Jerem. 52. 34: uncz bis an dē tage seines todes alle die tage seines lebens. This is the end of the prophecy of Jeremiah, but the Lamentations are omitted. On the next page the Middle German scribe 1 sets in again, with the book of Baruch: hie hebet sich an di vorrede in das buch baruch. The following forms occur: f. 153$^{r\cdot}$, *pristern*, *ous*; f. 153$^{v\cdot}$, *aus* (2), *tak*; f. 154$^{r\cdot}$, *gotis*, *wek*, *aus*, *iczleicher*; f. 161$^{v\cdot}$, *auf*, *gotis*, *dorin*, *vor-*, *wek*; f. 206$^{v\cdot}$, *aus*; f. 220$^{v\cdot}$, *ouf*, but *auf* more frequent. In this portion *au* is much more frequent than in the other sections assigned to this scribe, but it is reasonably certain that we have to do with the same scribe. This scribe continues to the end of f. 224, = Ezek. 45. 9: gerichte gar uñ |. On f. 225$^{r\cdot}$ the Bavarian scribe 2 sets in again: | und tut gerechtikait. The writing is quite different from the preceding. Characteristic forms occur, such as (f. 225$^{r\cdot}$) *gerechtikait*, *abschaidt*, *trukchner*, *subenten* (3), *moneids*, *gayspokch*; f. 227$^{r\cdot}$, *dresigk*, *gankch*. This scribe continues to the end of the work, f. 231$^{r\cdot}$, middle of col. 1, the end of the book of Ezekiel.

Jelinek, p. 4, does not notice this last change of scribes, f. 224–225, and in fact assigns this whole section, ff. 153–231, to the Middle German scribe 3, whereas it is very clear that this scribe had nothing to do with either of these sections. In the first place, the writing on f. 225 shows that a change of scribes occurred there, which Jelinek overlooked. In the next place, the section 153–224 shows *ous*, *aus* exclusively, whereas in the portion really written by scribe 3, vol. 4, ff. 11–146, *us*, *uf* predominate, *aus*, *auf* occurring now and then, but never *ous*, *ouf*, which are the characteristic forms of scribe 1; Jelinek has recognized these differences, pp. 38–39, but has failed to take them into account here. Furthermore, as regards the last section, vol. 6, ff. 225–231, Jelinek's own testimony is sufficient to show that this belongs to the Bavarian scribe. On f. 225 alone three instances of *subenten*, for *sibenten* 'seventh,' occur, and Jelinek, p. 25, states: "*suben nur bei γ*" (= Bavarian scribe 2). In conclusion I may state that Dr. Göldlin von Tiefenau has compared the above delimitation of the various scribes with the MS, and his comparison sustains my conclusions.

The following list will give a comprehensive view of the extent of the work of the various scribes:

Digitized by Google

Middle German scribe 1.

Vols. 1, 2	= 240 + 182	= 422 ff.
vol. 3, ff.	1– 6	= 6
"	8–128	= 121
"	137–144	= 8
vol. 4,	148–211	= 64
vol. 5,	1–186	= 186
"	193–206	= 14
vol. 6,	1–123	= 123
"	131–138	= 8
"	153–224	= 72
	Total,	1024 ff.

Bavarian scribe 2.

Vol. 3, f.	7	= 1 f.
" ff.	129–136	= 8 ff.
vol. 4,	1– 10	= 10
vol. 5,	187–192	= 6
vol. 6,	124–130	= 7
"	139–152	= 14
"	225–231	= 7
	Total,	53 ff.

Middle German scribe 3.

Vol. 4, ff. 11–146 = 136 ff.

Bavarian scribe 4.

Vol. 4, f. 147 = 1 f.

As has already been mentioned incidentally, whenever there is a change of scribes, the old scribe ends on the *verso* of a leaf, while the new one invariably commences with a new leaf. Vol. 3, f. 7, not being filled, also vol. 4, ff. 1–10, were most probably inserted later by scribe 2, on discovering the gaps left by 1 and 3. Vol. 4, f. 147, was inserted much later by scribe 4. The rest of the work of scribe 2 must be considered as having been done at the same time as that of 1 and 3. The fact that in all these other cases—vol. 3, 129–136; vol. 5, 187–192; vol. 6, 124–130, 139–152, 225–231—the pages are full at every change of scribes, precludes the possibility of the assumption of Jelinek, pp. 4, 5, that these portions had dropped out of the original MS, and were replaced later by scribe 2. In this case we must assume that the original remained with the present copy, and also that the original had pages of exactly the same size as the present Wb.; otherwise the last page of the inserted parts would not have been full, as is shown by vol. 3, f. 7; vol. 4, f. 10, f. 147. Furthermore, the section vol. 3, 129–136, which contains the new translation, could not have been in the original, as in that case its limits would not have corresponded exactly with the limits of the scribe who wrote it. As the last page of this is full also, we must assume that it was written just after the preceding portion and just before the following.

Digitized by Google

A causal connection probably exists between the various changes of scribes and the repetitions occurring there, which are to be explained as follows: When scribe 1 stopped at vol. 3, 128, he underscored in the original the last two words that he had copied, as a sign for the following scribe. The latter then started with the underscored words, but thought he would continue with a translation of his own. At the end of his eight leaves he marked the place in the original which he had reached, and the next scribe copied the underscored word again. This process was repeated at each change. F. 152, vol. 6, ends with a book, Jeremiah, and consequently there was no repetition.

In the case of the portions inserted later, the reviser who compared the copy with the original in the same way underscored the last words of the part to be inserted.

The duplicate version of Isaiah and Jeremiah, in vol. 4, is entirely by scribe 3 (except the first ten ff., which were later added by 2), and this is the whole extent of the work of that scribe. It may be that this was intended for another copy, which has not come down to us, and was put into the Wb. by mistake, in place of the books following Ezekiel; or it may be that the scribe mistook a mark in the original and began at the wrong place.

Walther treats this question of the MS and the arrangement of the text, col. 291–294, but his treatment is very inaccurate. He states that there may have been different scribes at work, but where, he does not know—col. 294: "Es mag der mit dem Gebet Manasse beginnende Band auf mehrere Schreiber verteilt worden sein, von denen der zweite mit Judith begann, und der erste, ohne der ihm gesteckten Grenze sich zu erinnern, einfach seine Pergamentbogen vollschrieb, welche etwas mehr Raum boten als man vorher berechnet hatte." He refers then to the duplicate portion of Judith 1. 1–7, but his supposition is entirely erroneous, as the duplicate page is by scribe 4 and was inserted later. Furthermore, the *same* scribe (1) wrote the first part of Judith in vol. 3, and the continuation in vol. 4. There are indeed several scribes in the volume to which Walther refers, but not where he supposes them to be.

Concerning the two versions of Isaiah and Jeremiah he says, col. 292: "Ohne Zweifel aber ist jener erste Teil des 4. Bandes gar nicht ein Bestandteil der eigentlichen Wenzelbibel, sondern dieser nur aus Versehen einverleibt. Denn er ist mit anderer Tinte und von anderer Hand geschrieben als das Vorhergehende

Digitized by Google

und Nachfolgende; und die Schreibung der Worte ist meistens eine von derjenigen in den übrigen Teilen abweichende, obwohl die Uebersetzung im Grund genau dieselbe ist. So lesen wir in der wirklichen Wenzelbibel: zu, ouf, milch, vliessen, wenne, menige; hier dagegen öfter: czu, uff, milich, vlisen, wann, menke. Auch begegnen wir hier manchen Versehen, welche der 6. Band nicht kennt, und die man für Hörfehler halten möchte. So lautet Is. 1. 3 im 4. Bande: Der auch sy hat erchant die chripp, im 6. Bande aber richtig und in anderem Dialect: Der ochse hat erkannt die crippe." He is here unable to discriminate between two very different dialects in vol. 4, Isaiah, though he quotes from both—first *uff*, *vlisen*, then *erchant*, *chripp*;—he merely assigns the whole to *a* new scribe, writing in *a* new dialect.

Next he quotes two other slight inaccuracies in Isaiah, vol. 4, to show the difference between this text and that of vol. 6: *verstumten* in vol. 4 = *vertumten* in vol. 6, and *regel*, vol. 4 = *rogel*, vol. 6. These inaccuracies of vol. 4, all of which have been quoted above, are insignificant scribal errors and do not prove anything. He then shows by a single instance, Is. 60. 5, where vol. 4 has correctly *die menke des meres*, while vol. 6 has only *die menige*, that vol. 4 can not have been copied from vol. 6. Nowhere, however, does he eliminate or even mention the possibility that both texts may have been copied from one and the same MS, unless he takes the above-mentioned differences, which are the only ones that he gives, as sufficient to prove this, which is certainly not the case. He proceeds, nevertheless: "So sind denn die beiden Bücher Isaias und Jeremias im 4. Bande ein Teil einer zweiten Handschrift dieses Kreises und von der Wenzelbibel auszuschliessen. Genau genommen also würden wir sie als eine zwölfte Handschrift zu zählen haben." In this connection Walther also fails to note the fact that the duplicate translation of Jeremiah contains the Lamentations, while the other, in the sixth volume, does not. This fact alone would prove that the version in vol. 4 was not copied from vol. 6. By calling the version in vol. 4 the duplicate, and eliminating it, the MS would have an additional lacuna.

The agreements of the two texts, which Walther does not consider, are much greater than the differences, as may be seen by reference to the following table, which is by no means exhaustive, the instances being taken from extracts which were made for other purposes.

Digitized by Google

Table showing agreements between the two versions of Isaiah and Jeremiah in the Wenzelbibel.

	Vulgate.	*The two versions in vols. 4 and 6 of the Wenzelbibel agree.*	*The other related MSS have different readings.*
Isaiah 2. 3	et ad domum Dei Jacob	zu dem *hause gotes* hern iacobes	zu dem *gotz hauss* [des] herren yacobs
Is. 7. 6	regem *in medio eius* filium	Kunig den sun	Kunig *in seiner mitte* den sun
Is. 41. 1	ad judicium	*zu* gerichte	*mit* gerichte
Is. 50. 8	stemus simul, quis est adversarius noster? accedat	mit einander ste wir, wer ist mein widersache, er trete czu	mit einander ste wir, *wer widersaget mir*, wer ist mein widersache, er trette zu
Jerem. 8. 14	silere nos fecit	hat uns *sweigende* gemacht	hat uns sweigen gemacht
Jer. 35. 11	a facie exercitus *Chaldaeorum, et a facie exercitus* Syriae	angesicht des heres der siren und sein bliben	angesicht des heres *der Caldeer und von der angesicht des heres* der siren
Jer. 51. 11	acuite sagittas	scherffet die *geschos*	scherpffet dye pfeyll

Digitized by Google

These instances in which the two texts of the Wenzelbibel agree, as against variant readings of the other MSS, are much more important than the differences quoted by Walther. Especially noteworthy are the omissions Is. 7. 6, *in seiner mitte*, and Jer. 35. 11, *der Caldeer und von der angesicht des heres.* The insertion, in all the other MSS, of the clause *wer widersaget mir*, is also significant, while the two texts of the Wb. follow the Vulgate. The change of *pfeyll* to *geschos*, Jer. 51. 11, and the order *hause gotes* as against *gotz hauss* also show the close relationship of the two texts under discussion. There is consequently no valid objection to the supposition that both were copied from one and the same MS.

The translation itself is doubtless of Middle German origin: Jelinek places it in Bohemia, in the vicinity of Prague, but he does not take into account the other MSS. The present MS is probably the oldest of the group, with the possible exception of the fragment cgm. 341. The earliest dated MS is Maihingen III D. 1, fol. 1 (1437). This also has strongly marked Middle German characteristics, as also the Weimar MS fol. 3–8, dated 1458, and the Nürnberg MS cent III, N 41–43, dated 1437–43. The MS at Nikolsburg I was unable to examine, as the official in charge was absent at the time of my visit.

The MSS of Walther's second subdivision, which have partly this text, partly a different one, are all late, and the Middle German characteristics have been obliterated, as they were written by Bavarian scribes: Cgm. 219–221, written 1463, by *Oswald Nott, at Tegernsee*; cgm. 502–503, written 1463, by *Georg Rörer, at Regensburg*; Maihingen 1, 3, D., fol. III, IV, written 1468, by *Georg Rörer.* Gotha MS 10 is closely related, but date and scribe are unknown. The Middle German origin of the translation is therefore established beyond peradventure.

FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE. W. KURRELMEYER.

Digitized by Google

V.—NOTES ON THE NEWLY DISCOVERED ELEGY OF POSEIDIPPUS.

This elegy is printed by Diels in the Sitzungsberichte der kön. Akad. der Wissenschaften zu Berlin (1898, LIV). The numeration is that of Diels.

In v. 11 *φήμη τὴν ἠφίεντ' οἰκία τοῦ* Παρίου, if, as seems to be the case, an oracle of Apollo is meant, Παρίου may be an error for Κλαρίου. *ἠφίεντ'* seems to be *ἀφίεντ'*.

Vv. 12, 13 are so given by Diels:

CA NAXHCAI·
ΤΟΙΗΝΕ.ΧΡΗΖΟΝΤΕΑΔΕΞΑΔΥΔΩΝΑ
ΦΩΝΗΝ ΑΘΑΤΗΝ ΩΝΑ ΚΑΙ ..ΤΕΜΟΙ

They are obviously in close connection with the former verse. Diels restores them, conjecturally, thus:

τοίην ἐκχρήσαντ' (?) ἐᾶτ' ἐξ ἀδύτων ἀναχρῆσαι
φωνὴν ἀθανάτην, ὦνα, καὶ ἴετ' ἐμοί.

A closer transliteration, perhaps, would be:

τοίην εἰ χρήσαντ' ἔαδ' ἐξ ἀδύτων ἀνὰ ῥῆξαι
φωνὴν ἀθανάτην, ὦνα, καὶ ἵλαθί μοι
ἵλατέ

(qualis erat) uox quam ediderunt tecta Clarii, talem si placet tibi oraculi instar ex adytis rumpere uocem diuinam, nunc, o rex, rumpe et mihi faue. ἵλατε would perhaps be nearer, and would include the Muses as invoked (1–8) with Apollo. In the beginning of the elegy (1–8) they are summoned from Helicon, and in 9 he turns to Apollo.

V. 14 is thus presented by Diels:

ΙΔΕΠΙΝΟΝ
ΟΦΡΑΜΕΤΙΜΗCΩCΙΝΕΜΟΥCΗΔΟΝΑC

This may possibly have been

ὄφρα με τιμήσωσιν ἐφ' οἷς ἔδον αἶσι δ' ἔπινον

ut me honore prosequantur uiri ad quos comedebam, feminae quibus propinabam.

Digitized by Google

In v. 15 I see nothing to alter except ποιήμασιν, for which I would write ἐπ' οἴδμασιν:

πελλαίου γένος ἀμὸν ἐπ' οἴδμασιν ἦγον Ὀλύμπῳ.

The ancestors of Poseidippus had migrated from the Macedonian Olympus to Asia.

Vv. 18, 19 appear to me to have been originally

ἀλλ' ἐπὶ μὲν πάρνηθος αἰδόνι λυγρὸν ἐφίζει
μνᾶμα· κατ' ἀχλὺν ἐὼν δάκρυα θερμὰ χέω
καὶ στενάχων ἠθεῖον· ἀεὶ δὲ φίλον στόμα ταρ[φὺ]

πάρνηθος is for παρηίδος of the tablet; ἐφίζει (Diels) for ΕΦΗ (Ζ Ε); μνᾶμα is my conj. for νᾶμα of the tablet; θερμὰ (Diels) for Κ Ε (Μ.).

V. 20 is more conjectural. Diels gives the reading of the tablet so:

ΚΑΙCΤΕΝΑΧΩΝΑΙΕΜΟΝΔΕΦΙΛΟΝCΤΟΜΑ (ΤΑΡ)

On my view of the passage, the poet alludes here to a dead ancestor, who had either lived in the neighbourhood of Athens or become famous as a poet there: his decease had plunged Poseidippus in mourning, and tears. If I am right, the language is very like Catullus, LXV 10 sqq.:

Numquam ego te, uita frater amabilior,
Aspiciam posthac. At certe semper amabo
Semper maesta tua carmina morte tegam.

except that Catullus sorrows for a brother, Poseidippus for a kinsman of maturer years. In v. 20 ταρφὺ might express the quick succession of tears which fall from the writer of the elegy as he recalls, in his obscure misery, a happier time.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

Digitized by Google

VI.—CATULLIANA.

A Letter to Professor Robinson Ellis.

British Museum, *January 4, 1900.*

Dear Professor Ellis:—

As I have seen an announcement that you have undertaken to issue a new edition of Catullus, I venture to send you a few notes of suggested emendations, the result of attempts made in spare moments to restore, on palaeographical lines, corrupt readings of the MSS. Perhaps it may be just worth your while to glance at them, though I do not presume to attach much importance to them.

I have taken the texts of the MSS G and O to work at, as those texts are, I believe, generally admitted to be the most valuable; and, in making conjectures for *literal* reconstruction of the words which appear to be corrupt, the readings of those MSS must be kept to, palaeographically, as closely as possible. The substitution of words which have no connection in palaeographical construction with the texts I should rule out of court.

II 8:

Credo ut cum gravis acquiescat ardor.

I think that the key lies in the awkward *ut*, and that herein is an indication of the ending of a 3d sing. verb. I suggest that *credo ut* is a misreading of *quaerit*. Suppose that one of the early MSS (the Verona MS, perhaps), from which G and O are derived, was a 6th-century MS written in Roman half-uncials; and that this passage was somewhat defaced. The scribe copying from it might have easily taken the *q* for a *c* and the first limb of a long *r*, and thus have turned *quaerit* into *credout*. Next, the misreading of *cum* from *quo* on the same lines would also be simple. The passage then would run:

Cum desiderio meo nitenti
Carum nescio quid libet iocari,
Et solaciolum sui doloris
Quaerit, quo gravis acquiescat ardor.

XI 11. I rather wonder that no one appears to have suggested

horribiles quoque ulti-
mosque Britannos.

Digitized by Google

Is the *quoque* too clumsy? The misreading of *q.* for *qq.* is obviously simple.

XXIX 20:

Hunc Gallie timet et Britannie.

I have independently conjectured *Nunc Gallie timetur et Britannie*; but I find that this reading has already been proposed, and has been rejected on account of the introduction of a spondee in the first foot. But is this fatal? This solution is palaeographically so simple. Suppose the line written thus:

nuncgallietimet'etbritannie,

the *ur* in *timetur* being indicated by an apostrophe, an ordinary mark of abbreviation. Nothing more simple than for a copyist to have mistaken the apostrophe merely for a mark separating the two adjacent *et*'s.

If this reading were allowed, I would also change *hunc* into *nunc* in line 21. Does it not seem rather absurd that two persons should be asked why they pamper one of themselves? In your commentary you seem to recognize the weakness of the 2d plural verb being addressed to Caesar and Mamurra in connection with *hunc*.

XXIX 23:

Eone nomine urbis opulentissime.

I feel pretty certain that the key here lies in the word *urbis*. Commentators generally have attacked *opulentissime* alone, and have accepted *urbis*. *Opulentissime* is such a monstrous word, that the scribes could only have twisted it out of something, much defaced, which looked like it. I believe that, having misread the preceding word or words as *urbis*, they fitted on *opulentissime* merely as a possible epithet. The correct reading should obviously be something abusive of the *Socer generque*—and the weakness of *urbis* has been noticed.

Do you think that *o bis improbissimi* would be possible?

I have no doubt that the original word misread as *opulentissime* had a letter with a long stroke below the line (*p*), and one with a tall stroke above the line (*b*, *h*, *l*). Therefore, *improbissimi* is not impossible.

Believe me,

Yours very truly,

E. MAUNDE THOMPSON.

Digitized by Google

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Critique of Some Recent Subjunctive Theories, by CHARLES EDWIN BENNETT. (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, IX, 1898.)

In No. IX of the Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, Bennett subjects my theories regarding certain uses of the Latin subjunctive to much illuminating criticism, and points out a few inaccuracies of which I have been guilty in matters of detail. I never find any great satisfaction in discussing syntactical questions which there is reason to believe can never be definitely settled; and, at first sight, it would now seem that we here have to do with just such questions. The personal equation seems sometimes to cause no end of trouble even in the field of syntax. Delbrück, for instance, regards my theory that questions of obligation or propriety like *cur non laeter?* developed from the Indo-European optative, as established beyond all possible doubt (Vergleichende Syntax, II, p. 389)[1]; Bennett regards this theory as without the slightest foundation to rest upon (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, No. IX, pp. 1–30). Again, Geddes (Classical Review for Oct. 1898, p. 355 ff.), after an independent investigation of the entire field covered by my discussion of the Latin prohibitive, and after extending this investigation also through the period of Silver Latin (a period not covered by my own investigation), says that his results for all periods are "largely confirmatory" of my own conclusions.[2] Bennett, on the other hand (pp. 48 ff.), after a careful examination of Plautus, regards these conclusions as quite groundless. When authorities reach conclusions so diametrically opposed to each other, after a study of exactly the same material, it might well seem useless to hope that, without new material to work with, conclusions could be reached that would be generally accepted. I venture to believe, however, that some of the more important differences between Bennett's views and my own are more apparent than real. This is certainly true as far as my theory regarding the force of tenses in the prohibitive is concerned, and the primary purpose of the present article is to make my position

[1] This view has also been adopted in the new edition of Harkness' Latin Grammar (§557).

[2] Since the above was written, Professor Clement, who has made a careful examination of my theory as applied to Silver Latin, has published (Proceedings of the Am. Phil. Ass. XXX, p. xxxvi) statistics showing that my claim regarding the energetic force of *ne* with the perfect subjunctive in earlier times holds good for that period also.

Digitized by Google

on this point clearer than I seem to have done in my original discussion. There are, to be sure, here and there a few real differences between Bennett and myself in our interpretations of certain passages. For instance, in Merc. 113 Bennett regards *caue praeuorteris* as "merely a mild self-exhortation," instead of an emotional prohibition, as I claimed it was. I am at a loss to know how Bennett can justify his interpretation. At the moment of uttering this prohibition, the speaker, intensely excited, is in such headlong haste to get to his master that he is gasping for breath (114), has burst his lungs, as he claims, and is spitting blood (138), threatens to knock over every one that gets in his way (115–116) and fight him (119), if need be. Finding that his knees are failing him, he cries out "perii! perii!" (124–125). A moment later (130) he threatens to knock the door into splinters. Furthermore, the act involved in the prohibition *caue praeuorteris* is the very act through fear of which he is so greatly agitated. Is one to look for "mild self-exhortation" under such circumstances as these? In several other passages Bennett's interpretation seems to me equally improbable (see below). But, apart from a few details of this nature, the seeming differences between us, so far as I can see, are due to the fact that Bennett has misunderstood what my theory really is. He seems to think that I claim that, whenever a person is aroused from any cause whatever, he uses the perfect in making a prohibition, quite regardless of the character of the act itself that is involved in the prohibition. I make no such claim as that. The emotion, or earnestness, which I claim lies in the prohibition comes from alarm, indignation, or the like, caused by a fear (real or pretended) that the act prohibited will take place. If this act itself is of such a character that no particular harm would be likely to result from its performance, I should not expect the perfect to be used (however much excited the speaker might be from other causes), except in those rare instances where energetic utterance is purposely affected for some reason. To illustrate: if, in reply to a threat of punishment, some one excitedly says '*Don't* strike me!' I should expect the perfect tense. In fact, one would have to search a long time for an instance of the present tense used in such an answer (see comments on Epid. 595, below) to such a threat. On the other hand, just such cases are not uncommon among the instances of the perfect tense. In every such case, if the prohibition is not complied with, the speaker will be made aware of the fact by some disastrous result. To show the contrast between such a prohibition as this and one in which an excited speaker uses the present tense, let us take the passage found in Rud. 968 hunc homo feret a me nemo: ne tu te speres potis, a passage cited against me by Bennett. I quite agree with Bennett that the speaker here is excited; but I do not see any reason for uttering *ne speres* with greater emphasis, or energy, than any other unemphatic word, or phrase, in the sentence, e. g. than *feret* or *potis*. Indeed, all of

Digitized by Google

the emphasis is upon *tu* and *te*. This would be made flat and ridiculous by translating 'For God's sake *don't* you hope (or, don't you *hope*) that you can!' It means merely 'Don't *you* hope that *you* can!', with no emphasis whatever upon the *speres*. Whether the act of hoping takes place or not, is in reality a matter of no particular concern to the speaker. Indeed, the interests of the speaker are so little involved in the act of hoping that he will never even so much as know whether the prohibition is complied with or not, unless some one takes pains to tell him. The present tense is exactly what my theory demands here. *Ne sperauerís* is probably unknown to the Latin language,[1] and in my Latin Prohibitive I lay the utmost stress upon the rarity of the perfect tense with verbs of this class. Indeed, the scarcity of the perfect and the frequency of the present with such verbs form one of the main grounds for my theory. I can imagine a situation under which I should expect even such a prohibition as 'Do not think!' to take the perfect tense. If, for instance, a girl were inclined to think her betrothed guilty of some disgraceful deed and threatened to dismiss him as a result of this suspicion, and if he were passionately pleading with her to believe him innocent, I should expect him to use the perfect tense in saying '*Do* not think me guilty!'; for her thinking so would mean the ruin of his happiness. Wherever the failure to heed a prohibition *even of a purely mental act* would be fraught with serious consequences either to the speaker or to some other person in whom the speaker takes a deep interest, my theory would lead one to expect the perfect tense. But it happens that no such condition of things is found among the instances of *ne* with verbs of mental activity, except *irata ne sies* in Am. 924 (see further comments upon this passage below).

I find that more than one reader of my original discussion have understood my position to be substantially that which Bennett has attributed to me. I am, however, considerably consoled by the fact that most of my reviewers have not misunderstood me. In re-reading my discussion, I still fail to see how any one can get the impression that my theory concerns *merely* the mood of the speaker without any reference to the character of the act prohibited, to the speaker's attitude toward that particular act, and to the results that will follow a failure to comply with the prohibition. I can, to be sure, detect a lack of clearness in two or three sentences I use referring to the context in which prohibitions stand, but in laying down the fundamental principles with which

[1] In Luc. Phars. 8, 451 both the MSS and editors are divided between *nec sperauerís* and *ne sperauerís*. In view of the usage elsewhere, there can, I think, be little doubt that *nec* is here the correct reading. Still, I can not vouch for the entire absence of such uses as *ne sperauerís* from the period of decline. Professor Clement has kindly called my attention to *ne inuideris* (Val. Flac. 5, 507 and Plin. Ep. 6, 17, 4), *ne expectaueris* (? Curt. Ruf. 4, 10, 32), and *ne credideris* (Curt. Ruf. 7, 8, 29).

Digitized by Google

I start as the sole foundation of my whole theory and upon which alone that theory depends, I am so explicit that I might fairly expect everything that follows to be interpreted in the light of those fundamental principles. When I appeal to the context, it is only for the purpose of getting side-light where side-light is needed for the clearer understanding of the speaker's attitude toward the act of the prohibition itself. With a prohibition like *ne speres* such a side-light is never (or, at least, seldom) needed; with one like *ne feceris*, such a side-light is *always* needed, since, without the context, one can never know whether the act involved is one of particular importance or not. As the fundamental conception upon which my whole theory rests, I claim (pp. 138–139 [6–7]) that the difference between *ne feceris* and *ne facias* is, that *ne feceris* is used of an act which must be prevented at all hazards; it implies that the speaker can not abide the thought of its happening; while *ne facias* is used when the speaker is taking a comparatively calm, dispassionate view of the prohibited act. Regarding this distinction my words are as follows (p. 139 [7]): "*I wish to insist upon this (feature of the perfect tense) as the only real distinction between the two tenses with ne.*" After elaborating this idea, that the choice of tense depends upon the character of the act as viewed by the speaker, I account for the predominance, in the present tense, of verbs indicating mental activity, in the following language: (p. 146 [14]): "If my distinction between the two tenses is correct, we should expect that a prohibition dealing with mere mental action, e. g. 'Do not suppose,' 'Do not be surprised,' 'Do not be afraid,' *would commonly take the present tense, because, . . . as far as the interests of the speaker are concerned, it matters little whether the prohibition be complied with or not.*" As the acts involved in such prohibitions are in their very nature of such a character that the thought of their occurrence would not ordinarily alarm the speaker, or arouse him to vigorous utterance, I claimed them forthwith as supporting my theory. I did not under these circumstances think it worth while to consider whether the speaker in any given case was, or was not, aroused from some cause not connected with the prohibition, for the reason that the question whether he was, or not, did not have the slightest essential bearing upon the application of my theory to the prohibition of acts of this character. Though the points above indicated are the essential points in my theory—constitute, in fact, all there is in the theory—Bennett seems oftentimes to have left them wholly out of consideration, and to have classified his instances merely according to the presence, or absence, of "special excitement" on the part of the speaker, without any regard whatever to the importance of the act prohibited. I may note, in passing, that Bennett makes too much out of the word 'excitement.' A desire for mere energetic utterance, without excitement, plays quite as important a part in my theory as does excitement. How, for instance, can any one get the impres-

Digitized by Google

sion from what I say on p. 139 (7) that I consider Cato 'excited' when he uses the perfect tense? The only explanation of these uses suggested by me is the importance, to Cato's mind, of the particular act prohibited, and a consequent desire to lay stress upon it. Furthermore, Bennett argues without any reference to the inherent probability of the existence of some distinction between the two tenses. Even Delbrück, with his own theory, admits (Vergl. Synt. II, p. 383) that the distinction I draw would be a natural one to expect incidentally. The proper attitude, it seems to me, would be to assume some distinction wherever we possibly can and reject it only when we are absolutely obliged to. If any one sets out to claim that there is no distinction between two different tenses, the burden of proof is certainly wholly upon him.

I trust that I have now succeeded in making clear what I consider to be essential in my theory of the distinction between the two tenses. As a fair test of the correctness of the theory, let all these prohibitions be divided into two classes—(1) those in which non-compliance will be disastrous or shocking, and which would therefore naturally be uttered with unusual energy, or earnestness; and (2) those of such a sort that it is a matter of no particular consequence to one's interests whether they be heeded or not, or of such a sort that no particular alarm is felt through fear that the prohibited act will be performed. When the particular act that is prohibited is of such a character that it falls *clearly* under one of these two classes, it is not necessary to take into consideration the context in which the prohibition stands. If a speaker were to adopt an emotional tone in prohibiting a commonplace act, he would make himself ridiculous, and arouse laughter instead of sympathy. However, in classifying according to the nature of the act prohibited and the speaker's attitude toward that act, there is room for errors. Even when a person is prohibiting an act which, if performed, would bring disaster, he may for some reason purposely soften his tone and use the less energetic form of prohibition; on the other hand, when he is prohibiting an indifferent, or a commonplace, act, he may as a bit of pleasantry, or from some other motive, adopt an emotional, energetic tone. This last might be expected to be especially common in comedy and other colloquial styles. But, on the whole, the general results of such a classification as I have indicated may be regarded as trustworthy.

If all the instances be divided into the two classes just indicated, it will be found that the instances of the present tense, with extremely rare exceptions, fall into one class, while those of the perfect tense, with few exceptions (comparatively), fall into the other class. In making this classification I am quite ready, for the sake of the argument, to exclude all those instances of the present tense which Bennett regards as subordinate, though many, if not most of them, are commonly regarded as genuine prohibitions. We must now further omit *ne attigas* from the list of

Digitized by Google

presents as being an aorist (see, for instance, Lindsay, The Latin Language, p. 464). Finally, we may omit *ne molestus sis*, which, in most cases, may be regarded as subordinate with as much confidence as many of those clauses which Bennett insists upon so interpreting; in any case, it is merely a stereotyped phrase (originally a mild 'Don't bother,' or 'lest you bother'), in which the tense was no longer specially chosen each time the phrase was used—the tense was inseparable from the phrase. This fact is recognized even by Seyffert (Bursian's Jahresber. über die Fortschritte der class. Alterthumswissenschaft, 22, p. 338), whom surely no one will accuse of being unduly partial to my theory.[1] In fact, this is about the only one of my contentions that he seems willing to accept. If this phrase were included, it would not materially affect our conclusions, as it is commonly prompted by trivial circumstances. Most of the remaining instances of the present are on much the same footing as *ne speres* mentioned above. Of all the instances, with one exception, in which the verb is one denoting mental activity (and these form a very large proportion of the entire number), we may simply say that the result of a failure to comply with the prohibition has so little bearing upon the speaker's interests that, as in the case of *ne speres*, he will never so much as know whether his prohibition is complied with or not. These of course may be at once omitted from further consideration. We may also omit from consideration all those instances which Bennett himself classifies as calm, commonplace prohibitions. Confining ourselves to the most emotional instances which Bennett has been able to cite, let us apply our test by asking regarding each, 'What will be the result of non-compliance with the prohibition?'

Capt. 947 ne duis ('you needn't give'). The person addressed will pay the speaker money for a slave instead of accepting him as a gift. It would be absurd to translate this 'for Heaven's sake, *don't* give!', as though the prohibition involved anything of importance.

Stich. 320 ne cures. The person addressed will try to play the agreeable by asking such innocent questions as 'Where have you been? What have you there?' Here again '*Don't* care!' or 'Don't *care*!' would be absurd translations.

[1] Seyffert has understood my theory, but he rejects it for the insufficient reason that he finds a few instances that seem to him out of harmony with it. His proper method would have been to apply the test to all instances. After doing this, it would then have been in order for him to make whatever comments he chose upon any instances that seemed to him exceptions to my rule. Such exceptions could not have been many. I do not appreciate the force of his argument when he cites against me Bacch. 597 mihi cautiost, ne nucifrangibula excussit ex malis meis. As if the idea 'lest he knock my nutcrackers out of my jaws' did not admit of energetic utterance! Similarly, *metuo ne defuerit oratio* means 'I fear lest words *suddenly fail* me'; *desit* would mean merely 'be wanting.' Seyffert further is forced to use against me *nil* with the perfect subjunctive, a use with which my theory regarding *ne* has nothing to do.

Digitized by Google

Ib. 568, 713 ne me territes. The person addressed will try to frighten the speaker. Here, as I have pointed out in 'The Latin Prohibitive,' the feeling is not that the failure to comply with *ne territes* will be disastrous to the speaker, but rather that it will do the person addressed no good to try to frighten him. No one would think of translating this '*don't* frighten me!' or 'don't *frighten* me!'. It means rather 'don't frighten *me*!', i. e. 'don't try to frighten *me* (for you can't do it)'. Clearly, then, this prohibition is not prompted by any fear of the performance of the act indicated by *territes*. Bennett here, as elsewhere, missed my point in commenting on my remarks.

If we were thus to go through the entire list of the most emotional prohibitions cited by Bennett, the result would in nearly every case be the same. The only possible exceptions are Amph. 924, Trin. 267, Capt. 548, Men. 789. But in the first of these *irata sies* may possibly be felt as the perfect of *irascor* (though this perfect is undoubtedly extremely rare). The second might well be taken as subordinate, depending upon *habeto*, in which case there should be only a comma after this word. As regards the third, there is hardly an instance among all those which Bennett insists (pp. 58 ff.) upon taking as subordinate that is more naturally so taken than this very clause; the sense would then be '(I say this) lest,' etc. Similarly, *ne obserues* in Men. 789 may be taken as parallel with *ut geras* and dependent upon *monstraui*. Among the prohibitions classed by Bennett as not emotional are found two instances of the present, where non-compliance might be regarded as detrimental to the speaker's interests, viz. ne duas (Merc. 401) and caue fidem fluxam geras (Capt. 439).[1] As regards the present tense, then, our results may be summed up as follows:—Out of some 68 instances there are *only two* sure cases of prohibition where non-compliance would be particularly detrimental or disastrous, *and these two cases Bennett himself regards as calm and commonplace in tone.*

If, now, we apply the same test to the instances of the perfect tense, we get a very different showing. Here non compliance with the prohibition will involve the following consequences:[2] *death* (or *threats of death*), in Epid. 148, Aul. 744, Merc. 484, Poen. 1023 (cf. 1025 f.), Mil. 1333 (a case of fainting); *loss of valued treasure* or *danger thereof*, in Rud. 1155 (cf. *perii* in same line), Curc. 599

[1] *Ne me deseras* in Mil. 1363 can not be included here; see 'The Latin Prohib.' (Am. Journ. Phil. XV 2, p. 145; Reprint, p. 13). Similarly, *caue praeterbitas ullas aedis* (Epid. 437) involves nothing of any importance, though the *caue rettuleris*, in 439, does (see below).

[2] In examining the passages referred to, one should keep in mind the fact that extravagant or energetic address always invites a reply of a similar tone. One need not therefore be surprised to find threats of murder, suicide, or the like, answered by the use of the perfect tense, even when the threats are not seriously meant.

Digitized by Google

(the parasite is escaping with the stolen ring), Aul. 100, Aul. 585 (ne immutassis nomen = 'do not play me false.' Bennett says this "entire passage is one of calm confidence." It seems to me rather that Euclio is constantly beside himself for fear that the gold will be lost. He has so little real confidence in Fides, and such fear of her betraying him, that he implores her again and again (with the perfect subjunctive) not to do so; cf. 585, 608 (the first words he utters after 586), 611, 614. Everything depends upon Fides. The *non metuo* in 609 is used not with reference to Fides' betrayal, but with reference to some person's finding the gold without such betrayal, i. e. it contrasts *inueniat* with *indicassis*. Euclio's actions and words betray at every turn serious fear that Fides will betray him. And a little later (624–660) he feels so sure that she *has* betrayed him that he can not be convinced to the contrary till he actually gets hold of his treasure again. It would be difficult to conceive of any one more frantic over anything than Euclio is in 624–660 over the mere suspicion that Fides has played him false. The energetic tense here is exactly what I should expect from such a character as Euclio, whose anxiety about his gold is his ruling passion), Mil. 1245, Bacch. 1188, Aul. 608 (see remarks above on 585), Aul. 618, Vid. 91; *personal violence, flogging*, etc., in Pers. 793 (cf. 780 ff.), Mil. 1125, Cas. 404, Trin. 1012 (The speaker is so wrought up over his danger that he calls upon himself to hurry five times within five lines in order to save his *scapulae* (1009) and escape the ox-whips (1011)), Truc. 943; *betrayal and torture*, in Mil. 862 (cf. 859); *ruin and disaster*, in Trin. 521 (cf. 524, 525, 526), Men. 415, Trin. 555 (If the person addressed *does* tell, the speaker will get a flogging, alluded to in *tu hercle et illi et alibi*, for balking his master's scheme, and both he and his master will be deprived of the only thing upon which their support depends; for, after learning the truth, Philo will take the land. Cf. 595), Bacch. 910 (the speaker's son will continue unrebuked his life of debauchery, which has just involved the latter in trouble, disgrace, and financial loss), Cist. 300; *starvation*, in Trin. 513; *insults to the speaker and his mistress*, in Asin. 625; *balking of carefully laid plans*, in Most. 1097 (a moment later, in 1108, the speaker ejaculates that he is ruined, and he threatens (1114) to set fire to the altar and burn the fellow off. Bennett says that an energetic prohibition would be "certain to defeat the object which he hopes to realize" and that the tone "can only be one of gentle coaxing." But I fail to see why "gentle coaxing" would not be as likely to defeat the speaker's purpose as an energetic protest. Any explanation that would make the former seem natural would make the latter seem equally natural. Furthermore, irascible people are very likely to defeat their own ends at such games by uncontrollable outbursts. The speaker, by the way, explains his earnestness in the next verse, in a way calculated to allay all suspicion), Mil. Gl. 1368 (Energetic utterance would arouse no suspicion,

Digitized by Google

as the speaker with the next breath attributes his utterance to anxiety for his master's welfare. The conceit of the captain would be sure to take this anxiety as sincere), Mil. 1371 (see remarks on 1368), Most. 401; *pursuit by ghosts*, in Most. 523; *escape of a lunatic*, in Men. 994 (Here *caue flocci feceril* is not an expression of mere mental activity; it means 'let no threat prevent you from carrying the lunatic to the Doctor'); *danger to the chastity of the speaker's daughter*, in Epid. 400 (cf. 404–405); *disappointment in love*, in Merc. 401, 402, Epid. 439 (the present subjunctive *caue praeterbitas ullas aedis* occurs in 437, but not so much depends upon a compliance with this prohibition; it was not important that he should stop at each house—an absurd performance and one unnecessary to the accomplishment of his purpose; the only thing of importance was *to find where Periphanes lived*, and a failure to comply with *caue rettuleris* would mean a failure to do this); *delay of important information*, in Merc. 113 (see my remarks above on this passage); *imparting of distressing information*, in Vid. 83; *shocked modesty*, in Mil. Gl. 283 (pretended resentment at immodest allusions are extremely common in Plautus); *wounding of loved one's feelings*, in Cist. 110 (depth of feeling moves hearers to tears; cf. 112); *failure to rescue master from a dilemma or mistress from grief*, in Asin. 256 (furthermore, the speaker will get a flogging that has been promised him; cf. 363 and 315), Stich. 285 (Here again *caue flocci feceris* is not an expression of mere mental action, but means 'let no one interfere with you').

The instances just given comprise 43 out of the 58 instances of the perfect to be found in Plautus. We have already found, then, that nearly all of the 68 instances of the present tense fall into one of the two classes into which I have divided prohibitions, while more than 74 per cent. of the instances of the perfect fall into the other class. This condition of things in itself, whatever might be the character of the remaining 15 instances of the perfect, is enough to establish in a general way the distinction I have drawn between the two tenses. But even the remaining 15 instances of the perfect are not necessarily unfavorable to, or even exceptions to, my theory. In fact it will be found that some of them support it in the most decided manner. All that my theory claims is that the perfect tense is the tense of energetic utterance. While such utterance would be commonly confined to the prohibition of an act the result of which, if performed, would be detrimental to one's interests, or shocking to one's feelings, and while such a classification forms perhaps the best general basis for classification, it does not at all follow that prohibitions may not be occasionally uttered with unusual energy, from other causes than from a fear of the results of the act involved. In fact, some of these 15 instances are certainly characterized by energetic utterance (as admitted by Bennett himself). The very large proportion of the instances of the perfect in which that tense clearly indicates

Digitized by Google

energetic utterance creates an assumption in favor of a similar interpretation of the remaining cases; and the probability of the correctness of this assumption is still further established by the fact that the present tense, as has been shown above, is almost exclusively confined to commonplace prohibitions, in which energetic prohibition of the particular act involved would be without point, and frequently absurd. Let us see, then, how far it seems natural to assume energetic utterance as characteristic of these remaining instances:

Epid. 595 ubi noles, ne fueris pater, 'when you don't want to be my father, for Heaven's sake *don't*!' This is the reply of Acropolistis to Periphanes' threat that he will kill her if she ever calls him father again. Energetic threats, whether seriously meant or not, always invite energetic replies. Prohibitions which are thus used in replying to dire threats and in the translation of which one naturally puts the emphasis upon the prohibition itself (e. g. '*Don't* do that!' or 'Don't *do* that!') never, I believe, take the present tense, while numerous examples of the perfect tense in such prohibitions have been cited above.

Truc. 606 istuc ne responsis. This involves a threat prompted by a defiant reply to the speaker, who is very angry and threatens to cut the former into bits if he adds another word. The words really mean 'Don't you *give* me such an answer as that, or, if you do, take the consequences.' Failure to comply will thus involve disaster to the person addressed. A prohibition which in this way involves a threat of disaster that will befall through failure to comply with it, never takes the present tense, so far as I have noticed; and this again is in strict accord with my theory.

Pers. 572 ne sis ferro parseris. If the speaker does not persuade the person addressed to act upon his advice, his deeply laid plot will come to nothing, and heavy loss will result. The *ne . . . parseris* may perhaps be used as an expression calculated to impress the person addressed, a procurer, with the exceptional value of the girl that the speaker wants him to buy. Every line of this speech is extravagant in tone. Excitement is not present, but energetic and extravagant utterance abounds along here at every turn.

Trin. 704 id me commissurum ut patiar fieri ne animum induxeris. The words of both Lesbonicus and Lysiteles along here seem to me brimful of emotion. See my comments below on this passage.

Asin. 839 ne dixis istuc.—Ne sic fueris, 'for Heaven's sake, don't *be* so!'

Epid. 723 ne attigas, 'don't *touch* me!' This is the surly reply of Epidicus, who thus shows his resentment at having been unjustly bound.

Digitized by Google

Pseud. 79 Eheu.—Eheu? idquidem hercle ne parsis, 'for Heaven's sake, *don't* be backward about asking for that!'

Poen. 553 nos tu ne curassis. Not merely in 541, but again in 571, the *advocati* are accused of being exceedingly angry, and both times on account of their spiteful language. Bennett would contend, then, that the *advocati* may fly into an angry passion, and use spiteful language, twice inside of three or four minutes, and that during the other two or three minutes there is "no vestige" of such a mood or tone. The tone of the *advocati* from the beginning of the scene has been for the most part surly.

Ib. 993 ne parseris, 'show him no *mercy*!' i. e. 'get out of him all the particulars.'

Asin. 467 caue supplicassis. Bennett himself regards this as uttered with emotion.

How far the assumption of energetic utterance in these 15 instances seems unnatural or impossible must be left to the judgment of my readers. To me it seems neither unnatural nor impossible. If, however, in any one of these passages such an assumption were to be regarded as impossible, then it might be set down as an exception to the rule, which would, to my mind, in no way destroy the validity of the general distinction I have drawn.

It will be noticed that I have in the above classification concerned myself solely with the instances of *ne* and *caue*. The other instances cited by Bennett are not instances of *ne*, or *caue*, and have been shown to have wholly distinct characteristics.[1] In 'The Latin Prohibitive' I laid the utmost emphasis upon the fact that my theory applied only to prohibitions expressed by *ne* and *caue*, and that instances of the perfect subjunctive with *nec*, *ne* . . . *quidem*, etc., lay entirely outside of its range of application. Curiously enough, my theory has been taken completely out of my hands, extended so as to cover phenomena to which I said in the most emphatic language it could not possibly apply, and then instances of these latter phenomena have been cited against me as though opposed to my own theory. I am more than ready to admit that most of the instances of *nec*, *ne* . . . *quidem*, *nihil*, *nullum*, *numquam*, with the perfect subjunctive, are at all periods of the literature dis-

[1] Whatever explanation be adopted for the perfect subjunctive after *nec*, *ne* . . . *quidem*, *nihil*, *numquam*, etc., it is an indisputable fact that its use with these words differs *in a very marked degree* in almost every respect from its use with *ne*; e. g. (1) with *ne*, it is never used in dignified, deferential address; with the other particles, it is very common in such address; (2) with *ne*, it is seldom used with verbs indicating purely mental action (at least before the end of the Augustan period); with the other particles it is used *chiefly* with just such verbs; (3) with *ne*, it is entirely unknown to many productions in which with the other particles it is common. Even if all the instances with *nec*, *ne* . . . *quidem*, etc., were to be recognized as true volitives, my theory would still hold good for *ne* as distinguished in use from the other particles.

Digitized by Google

tinctly opposed to Bennett's extension of my theory. But this does not, so far as I can see, affect the validity of my conclusions regarding the force of *ne* with the subjunctive.

Bennett inadvertently misrepresents me on p. 65, unless he is still to be understood as limiting his remarks to Plautus. I did not say that verbs of mental action are *never* found in prohibitions expressed by *ne* and *caue* with the perfect subjunctive. My words ('The Latin Prohibitive,' pp. 152–153 [20–21]) were: "in the whole history of the Latin language, from the earliest times down to and including Livy, there are to be found in prohibitions expressed by *ne* with the perfect subjunctive only two, or at most three, verbs denoting *mere* mental activity." I did say that no such instances occur in Plautus, and I still believe that to be true. None of the instances cited by Bennett (p. 65) belong to the class of phenomena of which I was speaking. *Induxeris* and *feceris* are not 'verbs' of mental activity, and his other examples are not instances of *ne* or *caue*. *Animum* with *induxeris* forms, to be sure, an *expression* (though not a 'verb') of mental activity, and should have been referred to by me as a kindred phenomenon. The expression *caue flocci feceris* does not refer to the *mere* mental act of *forming a low or high estimate* (see remarks above on these passages), and *flocci facere* is therefore quite different in character from *putare*, *existimare*, *metuere*, *sperare*, etc., etc.

As the use of the perfect subjunctive with *nec* (*neque*), *nihil*, *ne . . . quidem*, *numquam*, etc., is not included in my theory regarding its use with *ne*, consideration of Bennett's *critique* of my interpretation of these passages is reserved for another paper.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY. H. C. ELMER.

The Treatment of Nature in the Poetry of the Roman Republic, by KATHARINE ALLEN. (Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin, Philology and Literature Series, vol. I, pp. 89–219.)

With this dissertation of Miss Allen's and Mr. H. R. Fairclough's suggestive monograph on the attitude of the Greek tragedians towards nature, it would seem as if the claims of the ancients in this particular sphere were in a fair way to being vindicated, and the Philistines who are prone to regard nature as a wholly modern discovery discomfited. While Miss Allen has not so rich a field as her predecessor on the Greek side, and perhaps not so skilful a hand, she has succeeded in getting together a very considerable amount of interesting and valuable material. She gives a detailed treatment of all the poets from Livius Andronicus to Varro Atacinus, with the exception of the writers of comedy. Her method is in the highest degree systematic. In the case of each poet, sky, sea, streams, mountains, etc., are treated in succession,

Digitized by Google

and under each one of these heads the artist's use of simile and metaphor, the special aspects that he represented, the epithets he used, the type of feeling and appreciation of nature that he manifested, are set forth with copious and for the most part happy illustrations. Especially striking are some of the passages quoted from the early dramatists, and students of Latin literature, to say nothing of the ever-increasing army of students of literature in English, will feel indebted to Miss Allen for drawing forth so many gems, albeit broken, from the dark unfathomed caves of the editions of *fragmenta*. Indeed, the number of good lines found among the *reliquiae* of these pioneers in Latin literature is surprisingly large, e. g. the verse cited from Ennius, p. 98:

> lumine sic tremulo terra et cava caerula candent,

or the shepherd's description of the first ship in Accius, p. 116. Lucretius, naturally enough, forms the *pièce de résistance*, and some forty pages out of a total of one hundred and twenty are devoted to him, most of the passages being quoted in illustration of his appreciation—if so mild a word can be used of the Lucretian *μανία*—of the grander aspects of nature. Among the quotations from Catullus, most noticeable perhaps are the lines in the Peleus and Thetis describing the waves of the sea increasing as the morning breeze freshens, p. 192:

> post vento crescente magis magis increbescunt,
> purpureaque procul nantes ab luce refulgent.

From Cinna is quoted the couplet

> te matutinus flentem conspexit Eous
> et flentem paulo vidit post Hesperus idem.

At the end of the treatment of each poet a summary and general view of his attitude towards nature is given, and the whole concludes with a survey of the period.

Miss Allen's work shows signs of an unusually sober judgment, and her estimates of the different poets considered are for the most part sound. Perhaps the only criticism that need be made is that she is disposed to exaggerate the difference between the ancient and the modern attitude towards nature. That there is a difference, a very great difference even, no one will deny; but it is going too far to say that while the Latin poets of this period appreciated the various aspects of nature objectively, they had not, except in rare instances, sympathy with nature. The subjective view of nature so frequently found in modern poetry is, to be sure, less prominent in ancient, but it is there. It is exemplified, for example, in the couplet cited above from Cinna, and can be easily established for Catullus by reference to the thirty-first, the address to Sirmio, and the forty-sixth: iam ver egelidos refert tepores etc. Miss Allen's soberness of judgment, indeed, has the faults of its virtues, and, what is certainly unusual in a doctor's

Digitized by Google

dissertation, she is inclined to be somewhat pessimistic about her subject and to insist upon her authors' limitations. The irreverent sometimes say that searching Latin authors for examples of syntactical phenomena tends not to enthusiasm, and so perhaps a pilgrimage through the Latin poets in search of purple patches may result in some weariness of spirit.

GORDON LAING.

Digitized by Google

REPORTS.

HERMES, Vol. XXXIV.

J. Kromayer, Zur Geschichte des II. Triumvirats. VII. Dio's account of Actium is alone reliable, for Plutarch is unfair to Cleopatra. Octavian had completely blockaded Antony's fleet, and, by refusing a land battle, forced him to fight by sea. Antony's desire was to escape; so he burned part of his ships, and took with him the large sails, his best troops and all his treasures. Octavian secured the advantage by drawing him into deep water, where his own swift ships could manoeuvre, and Cleopatra, foreseeing defeat, escaped with the treasure. Neither she nor Antony was false to the fleet, but saved what they could. Rich Egypt, strengthened by Syrian and African troops, was their surest refuge.

U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Zum Oedipus des Sophokles. Oedipus is free from all guilt before and during the action of the play, but is the victim of an evil δαίμων; Kreon is an intolerable pedant and Pharisee. In 425 read ὅσ' ἐξισώσεις, referring to what his curses bring to his sons. Oedipus speaks the concluding verses for contrast with the proud prologue; the usual ending by the chorus is merely mechanical. The metrical irregularity of 1303 is justified by the excitement of the speaker. αἰώρα in 1264 is a hanging shelf for the toilet. In 1091 read σέ γε τὸν πατριώταν; τροφόν and μητέρα are distinct from Cithaeron; αὔριον is the subject of αὔξειν. 906 refers to a collection of oracles still existing in Sophocles' time. In 1280 read μονούμενα.

G. Kaibel, Longinus und die Schrift περὶ ὕψους. Cassius Longinus, the pupil of Ammonius Sakkas, was a critic rather than a philosopher; he was a rhetorician, and, after a fashion, a philologian. He was a pedant who lacked poetry and a sense of beauty. His style, like his criticism, is clear, simple, correct, but tiresome. No word above the ordinary level, no flush of enthusiasm, no flash of wit or humor. And yet this is the man to whom F. Marx (Wien. Stud. XX 169) has ascribed a work so full of charm and individuality, so rich in thought and so powerful in language as the treatise περὶ ὕψους. The double superscription shows that the authorship was a guess, and the style runs counter to the precepts of the Atticism to which Longinus did homage. This genius that disdains the trammels of style, this opulence of language, this wealth of figures and ideas, this deep penetration into the beauty of a poetic expression, this delight in possession,

Digitized by Google

in comprehension, in sympathy, would have seemed to Longinus and his like the ravings of a drunken man. The sphere of the *περὶ ὕψους* is unlike the sphere of Longinus, who is capable of admiring the jejune rhetorician, Aristeides. The complaints of the artificial style of the times remind us of Quintilian. The ascription of the decline of oratory to the loss of freedom and the materialistic tendencies of the age recalls Seneca, Petronius, Tacitus. The epigrammatic style smacks of the time when Pliny would write a whole letter for the sake of a single point. In fact, everything indicates an author of the early Empire.

W. G. Hale, Der Codex Romanus des Catullus. Coluccio Salutati obtained a copy of the lost Verona MS, from which about 1374 R was made, later G and O. The second class is derived mainly from R, but also from G, M being perhaps a direct copy of R. The archetype YD Ricc. 606 belongs to the BAV group.

H. Dessau criticises Arnim's chronology of Chrysostom's life. The date of Or. 43 is 105 or 106. Plin. Ep. 9. 37 was written in Aug. 107.—Th. Mommsen. The Roman loan to Salamis in 56 B. C. at first bore 4 per cent. a month, but after four years was reduced to 1 per cent. This makes 106 talents by compound interest (*perpetuae usurae*), but the creditors claimed 4 per cent. for the whole six years, which gives 200. The exclusion of freedmen from public office in the later Empire is due to Diocletian.—L. Schmidt derives Langobardi from *barda* 'axe,' and doubts the existence of confederations among the migrating Germans.—Th. Reinach. L. Corn. Lentulus L. f. was proconsul of Cilicia (*not* Macedonia) in 83–81 B. C.—L. Mitteis discusses legal details in the Oxyrhynchos papyri. In No. 34 the *Ναναῖον* is the native village registry, the *Ἀδριανή* the Roman provincial record-office. The *ἀπολογισταί* made a convenient book of extracts, the *εἰκονισταί* full copies for the archives.

B. Keil, Zur Thessalischen Sotairosinschrift. This should read . . . *τῶν πολιτάων οἱ πλέον*]*ες· ὑλωρέοντος Φιλονίκω Ὕιος· Θητώνιοι ἔδωκαν* and *ἀπολόμενα ἔσωσε· Ὀρέσταο Φερεκράτ*[*εος λέξαντος . . .* *Ὕιος* is son of *Ὕις* and *Θητώνιοι* appears in Steph. Byz. *Θηγώνιον*; only an independent state could grant *εὐεργεσία* and *ἀσυλία*. The Thessalian *ἀγορανόμος* was any magistrate who presided over the assembly. *προχειροτονία*, a custom of Ionian origin, is the decision of matters on the official docket, which came before (*πρό*) the rest.

U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Lesefrüchte. In Parm. 3 read *δαίμονες, ἢ κατὰ πάντα τατή*. The story of Angelos in the Theocritus scholia is taken from Sophron, who sometimes treated myths and fables. About 300 A. D. Athenian rhetoricians adopted the accentual in place of the quantitative principle in composition, though Longinus opposed the movement. The fiction of Cleobulina as maker of riddles is due to Cratinus' *Κλεοβουλῖναι* and

Digitized by Google

suggested by Cleobulus' success in this field. The Minyas, which told of Orpheus' return from Hades, first introduced the figure of Charon; he was a euphemism for Death, and appeared as a fierce dog. His function as ferryman comes later.

H. Willrich, Der Alexandersarkophag von Sidon. This shows us the lion-hunt of Krateros, near Sidon, with the hunter at the right. The king in the murder-scene is a Cyprian. The occupant of the tomb was Kophen, son of Artabazus; his beard, dress and features prove him a Persian, and his father's intimacy with Philip permitted him to join the hunt. Being a half-breed, the linen wrapping of his body is not so strange. Issus is depicted, since there his career began; the other battles are Gaza and the campaign of Antigonus against Eumenes in 317.

A. Rehm, Zu Eratosthenes. The Catasterismi were not scholia to Aratus, but an independent work written in Alexandria, which contained both myths and star-lists, and whose terminology and arrangement by zones appears in the list of Maass. It has been much interpolated from Hipparchus, and in its account of Capricornus was influenced by Epimenides, of Sagittarius by Sositheus. It was the first work to provide all constellations with myths.

G. Busolt, Plutarchs Nikias und Philistos. Plutarch follows mainly Thucydides, but also uses Theopompus until the Sicilian expedition; then he draws from Philistus, whose work, though based on Thucydides, was embellished by his own reminiscences and treated from the Syracusan point of view, with some criticism of Nicias. The references to prophecy are from Timaeus.

W. Heraeus emends the scholia of Servius. — H. Willrich. Philip of Macedon was killed at the instigation of the Lyncestae, who hoped, with the aid of Persia, to regain power. Antipater's prompt measures to protect Alexander show that he feared them and knew Olympias to be innocent. The inscription of BCH. X 299 belongs to the Mithridatic period; the embassy of l. 18 was sent in March, 81 B. C., that of l. 29 was due to Murena.—C. de Boor. Vat. 96 is the archetype of all MSS of Johannes Antiochenus, and its notation of *ἑτέρα ἀρχαιολογία* against the Salmasian excerpts proves them spurious.—F. Blass comments on CXIX of the Oxyrhynchus papyri.—A. Jahn publishes an essay of Michael Psellus on Plato's Phaedrus.—G. Kaibel. In Sophr. Frag. 166 a superstitious man speaks of the magic buckthorn; fables in Sophron are not proved.

H. von Arnim, Zum Leben Dios von Prusa. Or. 13 shows that Dio's patron was Flavius Sabinus, for *εὐδαιμόνων τε καὶ ἀρχόντων* must refer to Domitian. Sabinus was executed in 82, while Domitian's anger was fresh, and before the Chatti war of 83 the emperor had married Julia, Sabinus' wife. The reference to *delatores* in Or. 46 puts it in Vespasian's reign. The dates of

Digitized by Google

Or. 43 (101) and 48 (102) appear from allusions to the Bithynian revolt provoked by Bassus.

W. Kolbe, Zur Vorgeschichte des Peloponnesischen Krieges. Epigraphic lists of generals show that Kallias, Proteas, etc., belong to 432/1. As Kallias must have started about forty days (Thuc. I 60) after the Chalcidian revolt, but could not serve till Aug. 432, the revolt began about July 1. The events between this date and Sybota can not be put into the space between May and July, so the battle was fought in the previous autumn. Kolbe dates CIA. IV 179 in 432/1 and supplies many lacunae.

E. Schwartz. Tyrtaios. The second Messenian war must be dated about 500 B. C., as appears from Rhianus, Plato (Leg. 698 E) and an Olympic inscription (No. 252). The historians misunderstood Tyrtaeus (Fr. 5) and followed Herodotus, whom the Spartans had deceived. Hira is the same as Abeia. Its supposed location in the Arcadian mountains is due to Epaminondas' desire to connect it with Andania, the centre of Messenian religion. The plain of Stenyclarus belonged to Sparta after 736, that of Pherae as early as 800. Aristomenes was a Helot bandit, round whom many legends gathered. Pausanias follows an obscure Messenian, who drew from Myron. The poems of Tyrtaeus were written by a laconizing Athenian during the Peloponnesian war; much is borrowed from Solon and Athenian rhetoric, while we miss the Dorian pride of birth and love of sports.

C. F. W. Müller in Pl. Truc. reads 330 opperiar usque dum satis, 360 Ubi <cras> cenabis, 406 quae me caram item ut sese, 856 tonstrice matris mulcata, 862 Redhiberi vis, me alienare, 932 <si> ad, 954 quid tumes?—non succinctus ambulo, *tumes* referring to the purse hanging from his neck.—R. Kunze publishes an anonymous Greek MS from Dresden. The subject treated is astronomical, and the date 1300–1492.—F. Bechtel gives a list of new proper names in vol. III of Inscr. Gr. Insul. Mar. Aeg., and suggests that Ἀπάτη is the name of a girl whose father had expected the birth of a son.—P. Wendland cites many passages from Hippolytus on Antichrist to uphold the authority of E(broicensis) R(emensis) against H(ierosolymitanus).—P. Stengel explains ἐπάρξασθαι δεπάεσσιν, 'to take a libation (from the bowl) with the cups.' The wine was not mixed for each offering, nor did the cups need to be full each time. The libation was poured when prayer was offered, but not necessarily before each meal.—B. Keil reads κορύφαις ὀν ἄγναις in Alc. 5.

R. Heinze, Petron und der griechische Roman. The work of Petronius blends the Menippean satire with a parody of the Greek novel. Hence the tragic scenes, the imitation of the Odyssey, the rhetorical pathos. Hence the monologues, the dialogues, the forensic debates, the versified descriptions, the frequent saws. As in the novel, the lovers, Encolpius and Giton, wander in suffering,

Digitized by Google

and their beauty, through divine intervention, attracts many unwelcome lovers. The original element in the Greek novel is neither the sophistic nor the ethnographic, but the erotic, in which form it early found an independent development.

B. Niese, Zur Geschichte Arkadiens. The time consumed in negotiating for the accession of Tegea and other cities and the duties claiming Epaminondas' attention put the founding of Megalopolis later than 370, while the sending of Pammenes and the silence of Xen., Plut., Diod., point to some time after the Theban invasion, probably 367. The city was not intended for a capital, but to strengthen a rural district, and did not at first include Pallantion and Asea.—The Phylarchus decree (Ditt.² 106) belongs to 255–245 B. C. The Magnesian inscription (Ditt.² 258) does not prove the renewal of the Arcadian league, for Philopoemen, the Megalopolitan, was ever a faithful servant of the Achaean confederacy.

U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Lesefrüchte, criticises Jahnke's Statius scholia and Radermacher's Dionysius, comments on Lydus de mens., and defends λοισθίαν in Lycoph. 245. Theoc. VII 71–72 refers to places in Cos, and Ar. Rhet. 1384 b 13 to a statesman Heurippides. Rhet. ad Alex. is not by Anaximenes, and the Epist. ad Alex. was written by a different author before 300 B. C. Satyrus, the Peripatetic, lived at Philopator's court. In Ar. Lys. the women get water (328) from Kallirhoe (cf. 378); this supports Dörpfeld's topography.

E. Schwartz arranges in order the contents of Timaeus' history. —S. Waszynski. The public slaves in Athens were punished as well as protected by the magistrate under whose oversight they were, but were tried in court for more serious offences. They were crowned or even freed for special services by decree of the people.—G. Sorof. Xenophon presents Proxenus and Menon (Anab. II 6) as types of νόμος and φύσις, drawing largely from Plato's Gorgias and Menon, though painting a truer picture of the latter's character, and making some use of Thucydides (III 82–83). All three authors derive their views from Antiphon, the sophist.—J. Heinemann claims that our Theognis collection consists of verses by Theognis united with a selection from different authors, Theognis included, which omits political allusions and was orally transmitted.—J. Oeri gives Ar. Plut. 1030 to the old woman as a question.—P. Stengel. Eur. Phoen. 1255 ff. shows that soothsayers observed in what direction the gall spattered, the intensity and height of the flame.—F. Boll. The star Κηρύκιον is a staff in the hand of Orion.—C. Robert supplies the lacunae at the end of Euripides' Bacchae, putting Agave's lament after v. 1300.

BARKER NEWHALL.

Digitized by Google

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM, LV 1, 2 (1900).

First Fascicle.

Campanisch-etruskische Urkunde (F. Buecheler). Copy of an Etruscan inscription on a large clay slab found in the necropolis of ancient Capua. The first twenty-nine lines of this important document can be made out. The rest is past restoration. Buecheler considers it probable that the inscription refers to the mortuary sphere, with which we usually associate the monuments of the dead language of the Etruscans.

Zu Platon's Philebos (Otto Apelt). 13 B: for *ἐν ἀγαθαῖς ἐνόν* read *ἐ. ἀ. ἐννοῶν* rather than *ἐνορῶν* (Thompson). 15 A: for *ἡ πολλὴ σπουδή* read *πολλή που ἤδη*. 18 AB: for *κατανοεῖν* read *κατὰ νοῦν*. 23 D: for *ἱκανῶς* read *καὶ ἄνους*. 28 E: for *οὐδὲν τῶν αὐτῶν, οὐ δεῖ τῶν ἐναντίων*. 30 D: *γενούστης* is a joke after the order of Kratylos, and is not to be disturbed. Exegesis of 33 E, 34 B, 56 A. 56 A: for *ξύμπασα αὐτῆς αὐλητική* read *ξ. ἄνευ τῆς αὐλητικῆς*. 57 B: for *προβεβληκέναι σκοπῶν* read *σκοπόν*. Exegesis of 62 AB. 62 D: for *αὐτὰς μιγνύναι* read *αὐτὰ μ.*

Untersuchungen zu Ciceros Timaeus (Carl Fries). The prooemium was written after the Academica, consequently after 709—say 710. But that does not date the translation, because Cicero had a *corpus prooemiorum* on which he drew when he desired to inaugurate a new work, and Tiro may have clapped this prooemium on the translation. From the examination of the language Fries reaches the conclusion that the Timaeus was translated before Cicero wrote the De Natura Deorum, so that it belongs to the time of the Tusculan Questions, and Cicero himself joined prooemium and translation together. As to the object of the translation, K. F. Hermann's view that the Platonic Timaeus was to be the basis of a dialogue, in which the Pythagorean Nigidius Figulus was cast for a leading part, must be accepted, in spite of some difficulties. The article closes with readings from Codex Parisinus 6624, an exhibition of the dependence of Marsilius Ficinus on Cicero's translation, a rejection of evidence from the Ciceronian rendering of the Oeconomicus of Xenophon, on the ground that it has been tampered with by Columella, and an attempt to fill a gap in Tim., c. 9.

Der Schluss des aeolischen Epos vom Zorne des Achill (W. Helbig). It is commonly assumed that the old Aeolic epic of the Wrath of Achilles ended with the death of Hektor. But the first part of XXIII, on the burial of Patroklos, down to v. 257 can not be separated from XXII, which recounts the death of Hektor; and it is especially significant that in both books the purpose of Achilles to abandon the corpse of Hektor to the dogs, or to the dogs and birds of prey, plays so conspicuous a part. This purpose, however, was not executed, and Helbig suggests that the passage was struck out by the later redactor, in spite of the

Digitized by Google

announcement in the first lines of the Iliad: *αὐτοὺς δὲ ἑλώρια τεῦχε κύνεσσιν | οἰωνοῖσί τε πᾶσι*, verses which, according to Helbig, belong not to our Iliad, but to the Aeolic epic of the Wrath of Achilles. The version according to which Priam ransomed the dead body of his son is due to the milder Ionic spirit which did not sympathize with the wild vengeance of the Aeolic poet, who was capable of making Achilles reject the prayer of Priam and set the dogs on the corpse of Hektor before the eyes of the aged father. The verses (XXIII 184–91) in which the dogs are kept off by Aphrodite and the body anointed with oil while Apollo shaded the corpse from the sun by a dark cloud, are a very late fabrication and mark the *non plus ultra* of the thoughtless way in which later epic poetry made the deities take part in the action. The effect here, according to Helbig, is wellnigh comic.

Neue Fluchtafeln (R. Wünsch). Wünsch gives a revision of the new imprecatory tablets recently published by Ziebarth.

Die Idee der ersten Ecloge Vergils (M. Schanz). An analysis of the first Eclogue shows that the object is to thank Octavianus, the god in Rome, for protecting the poet's property in the distribution of land. Tityrus is the poet, but the details do not fit Vergil—the position of a freedman, the advanced age. It is an old difficulty. According to Schanz, the freedom which Tityrus gained at Rome symbolizes the liberation of the Roman people effected by Augustus, who was actually designated as *Ζεὺς ἐλευθέριος* after the battle of Actium. Tityrus is at once a representative of Vergil and a representative of the Roman people.

Vermischtes zu den griechischen Lyrikern und aus Papyri (F. Blass). Antistrophic responsion is often strengthened not only by recurrent words, but also by echoing sounds, and Blass undertakes to show the value of this feature of lyric poetry for textual criticism. A tautometric responsion is not to be disturbed, and is sometimes to be replaced. The other half of the paper is taken up with notes on the Grenfell and Hunt papyri.

Der Inhalt des Georgos von Menander (K. Dziatzko). In continuation of his article in the previous volume, Dziatzko takes up the Epidicus of Plautus as throwing light on the plot of the Georgos and as showing, at the same time, the great independence of Plautus in manipulating his Greek originals as well as the respect which he had for the views and customs of his public in important points. The marriage of children of the same father and different mothers would not have shocked the Greek. In the Epidicus, Stratippocles is shunted off.

Zur aristotelischen *κάθαρσις* (G. Lehnert). Bernays' medical interpretation of the Aristotelian *κάθαρσις* receives additional support from a closer study of the old commentators and scholiasts, and Lehnert passes a number of passages in review as the best preparation for the exegesis of the famous 'purging.' He then

Digitized by Google

proceeds to dwell on the delights of a 'good cry,' not unknown to the ancients, and winds up with a passage which Szanto has expiscated from Goethe's Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre, II 5: "Hier nun konnte die edle Dichtkunst abermals ihre heilende Kräfte erweisen. Innig verschmolzen mit Musik heilt sie alle Seelenleiden aus dem Grunde, indem sie solche gewaltig anregt, hervorruft und in auflösenden Schmerzen verflüchtigt."

Porcius Licinus über den Anfang der römischen Kunstdichtung (R. Büttner). Büttner upholds the old view that in the well-known verses of Porcius Licinus (Gell. XVII 21, 42): Poenico bello secundo Musa pinnato gradu | Intulit se bellicosam in Romuli gentem feram, the reference is to Ennius, and not to Livius Andronicus, as Leo and Schanz have maintained. Ennius was the Roman Homer, the *alter Homerus* of Lucilius, just as Chaucer was the 'Father of English Poetry'—not absolutely the first in order of time, but first in order of time and merit.

Der Pindarcommentator Chrysippos (A. Körte). The Chrysippos cited in the Pindaric scholia is not the famous Stoic philosopher, but is possibly identical with a freedman of Cicero's, to whom reference is made as a man of some culture. Said Chrysippos was a sorry creature of very moderate attainments and little common-sense, and Chrysippean notes on Pindar harmonize with this description.

Zur Epitome des Adamantios (R. Foerster). Additions and emendations from a Paris MS to the *Φυσιογνωμικά* of Adamantios, itself an abstract of the lost work of Polemon.

Miscellen.—L. Radermacher submits a number of emendations of Greek authors. Of especial interest is the list of examples by which he supports his recent contention that *διά* in compounds has often been added after *καί*, e. g. X. An. V 3, 4, *καὶ διέλαβον* for *καὶ ἔλαβον*.—J. M. Stahl discusses Soph. El. 221–9.—Hugo Rabe gives specimens of a prolix commentary on Hermogenes *περὶ στάσεων* which is as poor as it is prolix.—Breysig elucidates and emends the curious anonymous poem on the alphabet published by Omont in 1881, by the help of a commentary of the same date.—J. M. Stahl retracts what he said about the silence of the German grammars of Greek as to the abstract translations of the predicative participle (A. J. P. XIX 463), and cites Krüger, §56, 10, 2, *à propos* of his explanation of Thuk. IV 63, 1: *διὰ τὸ ἤδη φοβεροὺς παρόντας Ἀθηναίους*, where he divorces *διὰ τὸ ἤδη* from *φ. π. Ἀ.*

Second Fascicle.

Griechische Titel im Ptolemäerreich (Max L. Strack). A list of the titles conferred by the Ptolemies, with a discussion of a subject that is always near to the German heart, even in this democratic age.

Digitized by Google

Die Widmungselegie des letzten Buches des Propertius (A. Dieterich). A minute analysis of the poem, showing how admirably the two elements of the book are incorporated in the introductory elegy—the antiquarian, as Dieterich calls it, and the erotic.

Zum zweiten Mimiamb des Herodas (O. Hense). Rudolf Herzog, in his Koische Forschungen u. Funde (A. J. P. XX 459), claims for the speech of the Πορνοβοσκός a certain Ὑπερείδειος χαρακτήρ. With this view Hense is not quite in accord. True, the discourse of Battaros has a number of points of contact with the τόποι of Attic orators, Hypereides among them. True, Hypereides was not a scrupulous gentleman, and six of his speeches were held in defence of improper persons. But the tone of his discourse was that of high society, and Battaros is vulgarity itself. According to Hense, this mimiambus is not a travesty of Attic judicial eloquence, but a comic contrast to the elaborate apparatus and elevated tone of forensic oratory.

Neue Fluchtafeln (R. Wünsch). A continuation of the curious subject treated in the preceding fascicle.

Ein Prolog des Diphilos und eine Komödie des Plautus (F. Skutsch). FIDES speaks the prologue of the Casina of Plautus, ΠΙΣΤΙΣ, the prologue of the Κληρούμενοι of Diphilos; but what this figure had to do with the contents of the piece does not appear. Possibly the changes made by Plautus in the last part of his adaptation of the Κληρούμενοι may have effaced the rôle. Leo thinks that the close of the Casina can not have been that of the Κληρούμενοι, but Skutsch does not admit the cogency of his reasons, and adduces a story from Ovid, Fast. II 331 foll., in which Omphale and Hercules exchange raiment, and Faunus, who wishes to take advantage of Omphale, falls afoul of Hercules. It is a doublet to the scene in Casina, 875 foll., and may go back to the same Greek original.

Beiläufige Bemerkungen (H. Usener). I. In the first of these casual remarks Usener notices the recurrence of eclipses at the deaths of the heroes of universal history. As there was darkness over the whole land when Our Saviour died, so was there at the death of Caesar, and at the death of Nero. Even philosophers such as Karneades and Proklos share the distinction, and the Iliad tells of the darkness that Zeus shed on the battlefield when Sarpedon, when Patroklos fell. II. Sappho's Farewell to Virginity is paralleled by the hymeneal songs and observances of the Slavonic peoples. III. The metrical structure of the Sapphic hendekasyllabon in the Ode of Melinno on Rome follows Horatian law in thirteen out of fifteen cases. The other two Usener emends. IV. Inscriptions give indications of the decline of the worship of the old gods of Greece as early as the first century before Christ, even in retired Arcadia. V. The intercessory work

Digitized by Google

of the saints is a survival of the intercessory work of the gods. VI. Influence of the Stoic philosophy on the doctrine of the Christian heresy of the Monarchists, Noetos and his sect. VII. Eur. Andr. 848 read *ἐκ πέτρας*. The Leukadian rock is meant. VIII. An inscription on the inside of a well-curb: *ὖε, κύε* (Hippol. Haer. 5, 7) *ὑπέρχυε*, means 'Rain (Zeus), Conceive (Earth). Overflow (Well).' IX. On the use of *enim* in the Excerpta Valeria.

Zu den Fragmenten des Euripides (K. Busche). Various conjectures.

Miscellen.—Zu Alkaios (F. Solmsen). De Stobaei loco (U.).—Nachträge zu Plautus (C. F. W. Müller).—Zu dem Phoenix des Lactantius (A. Niese).—Brutes (A. v. Domaszewski).—Die Inschriften des Constantius Gallus (O. Seeck).

B. L. G.

BEITRÄGE ZUR ASSYRIOLOGIE UND SEMITISCHEN SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT, herausgegeben von FRIEDRICH DELITZSCH und PAUL HAUPT. Vierter Band, Heft 2 (pp. 155–278). Leipzig, 1900.[1]

The second Heft of the fourth volume of the Beiträge contains six articles.

The first of these (pp. 155–67) is a collection of textual notes by F. H. Weissbach on the Series *Maqlû*, parts of which have been already published by K. Tallqvist (Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae, XX, Nr. 6). When Tallqvist undertook to edit the tablets of this series, only two volumes of Bezold's Catalogue of the K-Collection had appeared. In the third and fourth volumes of Bezold's work, further examples of the series were mentioned as having been discovered. Weissbach, in his notes in the Beiträge, presents the results of his studies of the same series at the British Museum in 1899. He rightly remarks that the registration of even the most insignificant text-variant, as well as of every new word and line, must be of the greatest importance for the recognition of new duplicates or of allied fragments, and may sometimes even aid in their discovery. He then proceeds to tabulate the results of his investigation of Tablets II–VII. Of these, the fullest text which he has been able to obtain is undoubtedly Nr. VII, lines 34–49, which he restores almost completely. I will call attention merely to the occurrence of the name *Nin-a-xa-kud-du*, who is called elsewhere 'the lady of the shining waters' (see Hommel, Semiten, I, p. 383, and cf. Prince, JAOS. XXI, on the unilingual Sumerian inscription in ASKT., p. 105, 32, where this goddess is co-ordinated with Marduk). Weissbach publishes, on pp. 163 ff., the autographed text of the *Maqlû*

[1] For the report on Bd. IV, Heft 1, see A. J. P. XX, pp. 104–7.

Digitized by Google

tablet Nr. VII. While he admits the practical impossibility of a complete restoration of the *Maqlû* series in the near future, he adds (p. 167): "When we consider how many fragments of the series were recognized at the same time by Bezold when only a few of them had been published, we may regard it as certain that now, when at least $\frac{2}{3}$ of the entire series have been identified, a new classification of the Aššurbanipal library could be made with excellent success."

Weissbach's second article on 'Susian Clay Tablets' (pp. 167–74), with fourteen autographed texts (pp. 175–201), is an important contribution to the study of Elamitic literature. In 1899, Weissbach and F. Bork collated with great care a number of Susian texts, most of which had already been published by Pinches and Sayce (see pp. 168–9). Our author, while modestly admitting the imperfections of his new copies, due, as he explains, to the illegible character of the original, which frequently confuses signs of quite different values, insists, and with some reason, that he has improved upon his predecessors' work. The tablets here published, which are all in cuneiform characters in the Elamitic language, came from Kuyunjik-Nineveh and have been in the earth since 608 B. C., i. e. they must have been prepared at least one hundred years earlier than the date of the inscription of Bisutûn. On p. 201 Weissbach gives a list of sixty-five simple sign-values and of seventeen compound syllabic signs which he regards as certain. Bezold conjectures that these texts are all contracts, but our author, judging as much from the form as from the probable contents, is more inclined to regard them as letters. He wisely makes no attempt to translate them, no doubt considering Sayce's efforts in this direction as sufficient warning (see p. 171, note). As to the reason of these documents being found at Nineveh, he thinks that they are specimens of a correspondence between the Assyrian and Elamitic kings. It is to be hoped that a close study of these and other Susian texts will give us a more satisfactory knowledge of them.

Eugen Mittwoch, in a brief paper on Hebrew inscriptions from Palmyra which is accompanied by one photographic reproduction (pp. 203–6), discusses the textual peculiarities of an inscription in the Hebrew square characters written on a stone gate. The lines, of which a "squeeze" and photograph had already been taken by Euting and published by Landauer,[1] consist of extracts from Deuteronomy, e. g. on the lintel, from Deut. vi. 4–9, and on the left post, from Deut. vii. 15. Mittwoch identifies the fragmentary inscription on the right post with Deut. vii. 14 and xxviii. 5. As Landauer and Berger have shown, these inscriptions probably date from the third century A. D. Euting, Landauer and Berger think that the gate is part of the remains of an ancient synagogue,

[1] Sitzungsberichte d. kgl. Pr. Akad. d. Wiss., 1884, pp. 933 ff.

Digitized by Google

but Mittwoch regards it as the door of a private house. He points out that inscriptions of this sort, containing Biblical verses, may very well have been written upon private dwellings, just as we find extracts from the Koran inscribed on modern Oriental houses.

In the fourth article of the Heft (pp. 207–19), Moritz Sobernheim presents copies and translations of some hitherto unknown Palmyrene inscriptions which he obtained in 1899 while on a journey to Palmyra. They are all from Palmyra, except two grave-busts from Qaryetên. Of the Palmyrene inscriptions, the most interesting is Nr. 7, which was found on the side-wall of an entrance-corridor (pp. 211–14). The text stands beneath a pictorial representation, of which the author gives a fair reproduction. The context plainly shows that the inscription and picture both belonged originally to a temple dedicated to the god *'Azîzû*. The stone was probably merely used as building material in its present place in the gate. It is interesting to note that this is the first recorded mention of the god *'Azîzû* in the Aramaic inscriptions, although he is alluded to Wad. 2134, CIG. 4619 as Ἀζιζω. Julian, on the authority of Jamblichas, identifies him with Ares. There can be little doubt, as Sobernheim shows, that *'Azîzû* was connected with the sun-cult. The name is a common one for persons in both the Palmyrene and Greek inscriptions. The rest of the article is devoted to the inscriptions on an extensive grave-vault, of which a full plan is given (p. 215).

R. Zehnpfund contributes as the fifth article (pp. 220–26) a paper on the nature of the *zuqaqîpu*, which he shows to have been the ancient Babylonian instrument used for surgical scarification. On a unilingual Sumerian seal-cylinder, of which Zehnpfund gives an excellent reproduction, it appears as a double scourge, the handle of which was made of bronze, and the lashes of woven leather strips were provided with hooks at the ends. At the top of the handle are two balls, clearly intended to represent cups, into which the blood drawn by the scourge was collected. This operation was based on the principles of ancient phlebotomy, which taught that many diseases were due to a plethora of blood. According to von Oefele, cow-horns, calabashes, etc., were used for the same purpose. The same instrument is mentioned in the O.T. as *'aqrābh*, A.V. 'scorpion' (1 K. xii; cf. 2 Chr. x), and was evidently intended to be used in punishment. Its exact nature was not known until this representation was discovered in the ancient Babylonian literature. Its purpose is also plainly discernible from the same seal, on which a Babylonian surgeon (*âsû*) calls himself 'the superintendent of the divine scarifying scorpion' (*sukkallu ilu zuqaqîpu*). It was therefore primarily a surgical instrument, and was also used in a cult, as may be seen from the prefixed *ilu*. Zehnpfund's paper is a highly important contribution toward the study of ancient Babylonian medical methods.

Digitized by Google

The last article in the Beiträge, by Thomas Friedrich (pp. 227–78), is an interesting account, with illustrations, of the recent German excavations at Senjirli,[1] with special reference to the *ekal Xatti* and the *bît xillâni* (pp. 243–78). Friedrich shows (p. 247) that the word *ekal* in building-inscriptions indicates, not only the entire palace, but also any single room. This explains the frequent statements that *ekallâte*, e. g. *certain rooms*, are made of ivory, or of various valuable woods. The combination of clay and wood in the adornment of a room was called *nipîšti Xatti*, both in Assyria (p. 244) and in Babylonia (p. 247). H. Barth (ZA. III, p. 93) sees a cognate to Assyrian *xillâni* in Heb. *ḥ*ᵉ*lôn*. The probability is, however, that *xillâni* means not merely 'window,' but any opening in the wall.[2] Friedrich thinks that *bît xillâni* and other similar expressions denote a covered hall or corridor constructed in Hittite style, connecting two apartments or parts of a building.

There can be no doubt that the discoveries of the Germans in Southern Babylonia are of the highest value for our knowledge of ancient Babylonian architecture.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY. J. DYNELEY PRINCE.

[1] Mitth. aus d. Or. Sammlungen d. kgl. Museen z. Berlin, XII 2, 1898.
[2] Ball in PSBA. IX, 1887, p. 67.

Digitized by Google

BRIEF MENTION.

The first volume of the Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας contains the first part of the Catalogue of the Epigraphical Museum, the second, by KAVVADIAS, a treatise of especial interest, which bears the title: τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ ἐν Ἐπιδαύρῳ καὶ ἡ θεραπεία τῶν ἀσθενῶν. The introduction deals with Asklepios, the origin and spread of his cult, its rise in Thessaly and its introduction into Epidauros, which became, as it were, the archi-episcopal see of Aesculapian worship and was looked upon even by the faithful in Kos as the mother shrine. In the next chapter we are told how all the territory of Epidauros was sacred to Asklepios, and we follow the fortunes of the sanctuary in antiquity. The Roman Empire only enhanced the reputation of this great health-resort; and to form an image of Epidauros, M. KAVVADIAS bids us make a manner of composite photograph out of Our Lady of Lourdes, the waters of Marienbad, and the Kneipp cure. Even the decrees issued from Christian Constantinople were not at once fatal. But while the double wall about the τέμενος may have sufficed to check the incursions of the Goths in 395, nothing could withstand the determined onslaught of Theodosios the Second, and from him dates the final extinction of the worship of Asklepios (426). The temple and the tholos of Polykleitos remained long intact, but the fearful earthquakes of 522 and 551 shattered temple and tholos and theatre, and then the night of the Middle Ages settled upon the scene. Hereupon follows a list of visitors — Desmonceaux (1669), Chandler (1762), Dodwell (1805), 'Classic Gell' (1810), Leake (1830), Blouet, Pouqueville, and Curtius, with an account of the excavations conducted by M. KAVVADIAS as ephoros from 1881 to 1887 and from 1891 to 1898. The excavations of the first period are recorded in the first volume of the *Fouilles d'Épidaure*. The accounts of the later work are scattered through various reports and journals, so that M. KAVVADIAS has done a service for which all will be grateful in bringing the whole subject within the compass of a single volume of moderate size and popular style. Epidauros is one of the first points reached in Dörpfeld's Peloponnesian tour, and stands out with the freshness of a virgin experience in the mind of every one who has been privileged to follow the guidance of that unrivalled interpreter of the architectural past of Greece. To hear the words of the three great tragic poets borne up from the orchestra of the theatre at Epidauros gives a thrill never to be forgotten, no matter what theory of Greek pronunciation is

Digitized by Google

followed. The whole book is full of memories as well as of instruction, and I leave it with regret. The student of epigraphics will be glad to have the photograph of the Paian of Isyllos, and he whose head has not been permanently turned by the first glass of masticha taken on the dusty road from the Piraeus to Athens will be interested to find that M. KAVVADIAS has thought it best to translate into the modern idiom, τῶν πολλῶν χάριν, the famous passage of the Plutus which describes Karion's adventures in the temple of Asklepios. Evidently M. KAVVADIAS does not believe in any of the familiar formulae as to the relation of the ancient to the modern tongue.

Frederic Harrison's words: 'Horace remains to this day the type of the untranslatable,' form one of the mottoes of IMELMANN'S *Donec gratus eram tibi. Nachdichtungen und Nachklänge aus drei Jahrhunderten* (Berlin, Weidmann). But this discouraging sentence is balanced by one of Herder's: 'Vielleicht hat sich kein Dichter lieblicher und öfter als Er metempsychosieret.' Now, metempsychosis, according to Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (A. J. P. XIII 517), is the highest achievement in translation, so that Herder welcomes success where Frederic Harrison pronounces failure. IMELMANN'S specimens, which nearly all bear well-known names, begin with Weckherlin (1584–1653) and end with Theodore Martin (1878). The only other English version is by the elder Lord Lytton, and the compiler has been rather unfortunate in his choice of Martin's mate. It is nearly thirty years since I undertook to show, at unnecessary length, Lord Lytton's eminent unfitness for the task. 'Horace,' I said in the New Eclectic Magazine, April, 1870, 'is the despair of translators. His Muse, like his own Lyde, has her hair gathered into a tidy knot after the Laconic fashion. His English copies are either bald or buried under a horse-hair wig'—and Lord Lytton's copy seemed to me exceptionally bad. 'The tightly twisted toils, through which only a Marsian boar could burst, are ravelled out into a thin gauze which irritates without detaining.' The verse is 'rugged and inharmonious,' 'an Indian jungle of cretics, antispasts, molossi and proceleusmatics.' 'The rendering is needlessly verbose and abounds in Bulwerian capitals.' Adjectives are multiplied in defiance of Horace's well-known parsimony. The false picturesque is coupled with the tamest commonplace, and so on through the whole register of leaden coins which the critic of that day nailed remorselessly to the counter. I am not certain that all the details of that criticism are just, and the tone is very different from the mildness of the *Brief Mention* of to-day; but I am very sure that Professor Shorey's notes on Horace, Carm. III 9, would have helped IMELMANN to a better English metempsychosis. But IMELMANN'S slip in one of his

Digitized by Google

English selections is pardonable, and the notes which accompany his specimens will be read with interest by students of German literature.

An editor of Pindar may well be expected to heed the proverb: *μὴ κίνει Καμάριναν*, and even if I had not known the proverb, I should have profited by the experience which brought upon my head a weighty reply of nearly twenty pages to a modest and, as I had fancied, an irrefragable criticism. (Comp. A. J. P. VIII 228 with IX 158–77.) Since that time the subject of the Sequence of Tenses in Latin has been sacrosanct to me. Not that I have changed my views in the least. It was no new doctrine to me that the subjunctive tenses in Latin have a time of their own, but I considered it equally unquestionable that under the pressure of the established machinery of the compound sentence the differences that are plain enough in the simple sentence are sometimes crushed out, just as nature is, only too often, crushed out by society. What havoc is made, for instance, by *oratio obliqua*! There is but one infinitive to represent all the three past tenses; there is no way of rendering the difference between the long imperative and the short imperative; there is practically only one form for the unreal conditional sentence. And as a matter of practice, it still seems to me that the much-abused rules for the sequence of tenses are much more easily learned than the psychological refinements that have been proposed as substitutes for them. But I have already said all that I desire to say on the subject, and my present office is merely to register the results arrived at by a pupil and admirer of Professor HALE. In his *Sequence of Tenses based on Caesar's Gallic War*, Professor ARTHUR TAPPAN WALKER reaches the following conclusion: 'I believe that in Caesar every tense of the subjunctive and indicative alike has its own meaning and is never wrested from that meaning by a rule of sequence. But I believe also that Caesar had a feeling of sequence that led him to avoid irregular uses of the subjunctive and gave him a tendency to use an equivalent indicative construction, if possible, or otherwise to recast the sentence.' So, for instance, according to Professor WALKER, Caesar deliberately dodges the use of the perfect subjunctive representing the imperfect indicative of the question—ay, dodges it, *tamquam scopulum*, to use the language of the illustrious author of the treatise *de Analogia*. Possibly some one will arise and say that Caesar's regularity was intended simply to spite Professor HALE; and if I had not renounced all discussion of the subject, I might venture to remark that Professor WALKER'S articles of faith, like some others, are hard to reconcile. How, for instance, the imperfect subjunctive can be said to have its own meaning when it is used 'with an aoristic force' or 'with the force of an aoristic pluperfect,' I fail to see.

Digitized by Google

The initial volumes of the Oxford *Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca* are externally attractive, as was to be expected of the Clarendon Press. The type is clear, the paper good, the limp cloth binding exceptionally strong, the price very reasonable. The list of editors includes many of the leading names in the classical world of Great Britain and Ireland, and in most cases special fitness will be recognized. Aeschylus has fallen to SIDGWICK; Apollonius to SEATON, who has worked in his author for years; Catullus and ROBINSON ELLIS infallibly suggest each the other. Every one will recognize the property that REID, WILKINS and PURSER have in Cicero, that BUTCHER has in Demosthenes; MONRO has made Homer his dwelling-place for more than a score of years, LINDSAY is a Plautine scholar of high rank, TYRRELL has a right to Terence, POSTGATE has done noteworthy work in the Latin elegiacs. But to specify further would be invidious. The specimen numbers comprise the first four books of *Thucydides*, by H. STUART JONES, of Trinity College, Oxford; the first two tetralogies of *Plato*, by J. BURNET, of St. Andrews; *Lucretius*, by CYRIL BAILEY, of Exeter College; and the minor works of *Tacitus*, by the well-known translator and editor of Tacitus, H. FURNEAUX. As there is no English text, the price can be kept down in the American market, and, under the editorial supervision of such scholars as have been named, the series can not fail to find wide acceptance in this country as well as in England.

Years before Shilleto wrote his Appendix B to his edition of *De Falsa Legatione*, in which he ascribed the negative in ὥστ' οὐ with inf. to the influence of *oratio obliqua*, Poppo—it was in 1835—had hit upon the same explanation in his commentary on Thuk. V 40, though he failed to carry out the principle. Madvig soon made the observation common property, and some space was given to the subject in this Journal, VII 174, not because of the novelty of the thesis, but because of a strange mistake made in the earlier editions of that authoritative manual, Professor Goodwin's Moods and Tenses. See A. J. P. VI 523. In the article of the Journal referred to, I have considered a number of the passages that have given the commentators trouble, and on one of these Dr. SANDYS has bestowed a relatively long note in the volume with which he has recently enriched his Demosthenic series: *Demosthenes On the Peace, Second Philippic, On the Chersonesus, Third Philippic* (Macmillan). This new work has been done in Dr. SANDYS' usual excellent style, and to characterize it I should have to repeat what I have often said of the accomplished Public Orator in the University of Cambridge, who has made himself a special place among the students of Attic oratory. The passage which many commentators have passed over dryshod is found in the Third Philippic (IX 48), and, to save the reader the trouble of turning to the text, I quote it entire: πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ ἀκούω Λακεδαιμονίους τότε καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἄλλους,

Digitized by Google

τέτταρας μῆνας ἢ πέντε, τὴν ὡραίαν αὐτὴν, ἐμβαλόντας ἂν καὶ κακώσαντας τὴν χώραν ὁπλίταις καὶ πολιτικοῖς στρατεύμασιν ἀναχωρεῖν ἐπ' οἶκου πάλιν, οὕτω δ' ἀρχαίως εἶχον μᾶλλον δὲ πολιτικῶς ὥστε οὐδὲ χρημάτων ὠνεῖσθαι παρ' οὐδενὸς ἀλλ' εἶναι νόμιμόν τινα καὶ προφανῆ τὸν πόλεμον. Nothing seems clearer to me than the domination of *ἀκούω*. Such is the suggestion of Shilleto, such the doctrine of Seume. But Dr. SANDYS rebels on the ground of the remoteness of *ἀκούω*. And yet there is no difficulty in the shift from the infinitive *ἀναχωρεῖν* to the indicative *οὕτω δ' ἀρχαίως εἶχον*, nor is there anything surprising in the omission of *ὅτι*. The use of *ὅτι* would have involved reflexion, and reflexion would have checked the vault from the infinitive to the indicative. *ἀρχαίως ἔχειν* would not have been so clear as the imperfect indicative, and the falling out of the line of the construction is quite in keeping with the swing of the passage. The other two exceptions cited by Dr. SANDYS—Lykurg. 53 and Dem. LIII 1—are both discussed in the article mentioned, and I repeat here my explanation of the second passage for the sake of a parallel which has since suggested itself. 'In Dem. LIII 1: *οὐδ' αὖ οὕτως ἄπορος ἦν οὐδ' ἄφιλος ὥστ' οὐκ ἂν ἐξευρεῖν τὸν ἀπογράψοντα*, the imperf. *ἦν*,' I said, 'might fairly be held to be the imperfect of impression (*I seemed to myself*), and so in the antithesis we have *ἡγησάμενος*.' In like manner, Antiphon, II *β*, 9: *ἤδη ἑκστησόμενος* is balanced by *ἀπεστερούμην*. It is nothing but the old formula, Imperf. Ind. = *ἔμελλον* + Fut. Inf.

When one turns from the adequate editions such as Dr. SANDYS has given us to the run of manufactures that call themselves commentaries, one is tempted to unphilosophical impatience. With all charity for divergent ideals of the editor's work, there are certain essentials that go to make up any decent performance in the editorial line. The editor may prefer to limit the range of illustrative quotation to the author himself or to congeneric literature, and yet not fall short of his duty. He may despatch matters grammatical with a word or two and escape reproach. He may decline to wander off into historical excursions and may content himself with a curt explanation of allusions and the barest summaries of situations. The use of plastic and keramic art by way of illustration is to a large extent a matter of sphere and judgment. But every side of an author is to be illuminated, and no real difficulty is to be shirked. How capricious many commentators are, is a fact that needs no emphasis. Some write to meet the demands of commerce, some to air their own notions, and, as a natural consequence, there has been gathering for some years a rebellion against commentaries, the signs of which have been noted in this Journal. We are becoming familiar with the aspect of texts devoid of apparatus beyond a general introduction and an historical and geographical register. Then there are other editions intended to smooth the way of the reader as much

Digitized by Google

as possible. They do not go so far as to furnish interlinear translations, but there is ever a prompter at the reader's side, and not even the most gentle exercise of the intellect is permitted. The stores of more ambitious predecessors are laid under contribution and their notes appropriated so far as they are useful to the mild meddlers with classical literature. To these are added renderings of the most familiar idioms and turns of expression. There is an analysis, often borrowed, a few cheap illustrations, a metrical scheme, if the text is poetical, an appendix of variants to show that the editor is a critical scholar as well as a friend in need. Such is the character of the *Euripides auf Tauris*, edited by Dr. SIEGFRIED REITER, which forms the sixth volume of the Freytag *Sammlung griechischer u. römischer Klassiker, mit erklärenden Anmerkungen.* That such editions will breed scholars I do not believe, and it is a sad omen that towards the close of the text two of the verses, 1362–3, have been thrown into *pi* that reminds one of a disorderly linotype. But that the scheme is calculated to meet a demand there can, unfortunately, be no question.

E. W. F.: At the sight of a new book of etymologies such as E. LIDÉN'S *Studien zur altindischen und vergleichenden Sprachgeschichte* (Leipzig, Harrassowitz), one is tempted to ask *cui bono?* The good to the author is very sure—the absorbing interest of solving, after finding, the problem. But there is a practical good. Take an etymology like the comparison of post-Vedic *vāgurā* 'net, snare, yarn' with Lat. *vēlum* 'sail' (p. 21). There is no profit in knowing this as an isolated fact. It is not, past all doubt, certainly true, as *vellus* 'fleece' offers a possible *rapprochement* for *vēlum* nearer home; but, supposing it to be true that *vēlum* meant 'yarn,' then Plautus's *verborum velitatio* means etymologically 'word-wrangle.' This lets us explain *vēles* 'skirmisher' as a transformation of *vēlox* 'swift' under the influence of *comes, miles, eques, pedes.* A danger of morphological studies may here be mentioned, *à propos* of the name *zebrule*, just given to a cross between the zebra and Shetland pony—clearly assimilated to the word *mule.* Dialectically we know in America the slang-formation *animule.* Will the etymologists of the future abstract a suffix and write *m-ule*, perhaps? He will perhaps even speak of the verb-suffix (nasal affix, infix?) *-m*, if he should have to explain the *youm, weem, theym* of the Cape Cod dialect, obviously infections from *I'm*; and if the locution *I'm is*, which I have heard from babies learning to talk and from a few negroes, should have to be explained, one wonders how it will be treated by the linguistics of 3000 A. D.! Is it a depressing reflection to note that the advance of new, and better, etymologies lies over the remains of old, and good, etymologies, here interred, for the most part, in footnotes? No; for that is part of our counsel of perfection.

Digitized by Google

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 812 Broadway, New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Bosworth (E. W.) Hand-book of Latin Notes. Richmond, Va., *Whittet & Shepperson*, 1899. c. 121 pp. 8vo, cl., 75 cts.

Cynewulf. The Christ of Cynewulf; with introd., notes and glossary, by A. S. Cook. Boston, *Ginn*, 1900. c. 97 + 294 pp. 8vo, cl., $1.65.

Demosthenes. On the Peace: Second Philippic; On the Chersonesus; and Third Philippic; introd., and critical and explanatory notes, by J. Edwin Sandys. New York, *Macmillan*, 1900. 72 + 260 pp. 16mo, cl., net $1.10.

Gudeman (Alfred), Ed. Latin Literature of the Empire; selected and ed., with rev. texts and introds. New York, *Harper*, 1900. c. 2 v. 12mo, cl., ea. $1.80.

Homer. Four Books of the Iliad, 1, 6, 22, 24; tr. by W. C. Bryant, with introd. and notes. Boston, *Houghton, Mifflin & Co.* [1899]. c. 9 + 119 pp. 16mo, pap., net 15 cts.

—— Iliad; ed., with apparatus criticus, prolegomena, notes and appendices, by Walter Leaf. V. 1, bks. 1–12. 2d ed. New York, *Macmillan*, 1900. 36 + 600 pp. 8vo, cl., net $4.

Ovid. First and Second Books of Ovid's Metamorphoses, with Ovid's Autobiography; ed., for the use of schools, by W. T. Peck. Boston, *Ginn*, 1900. c. 12 + 234 pp. 16mo, cl., 55 cts.

Saurusaitis (P.) An Abridged Dictionary of the English-Lithuanian Languages. Waterbury, Ct., *P. Saurusaitis*, 1899. c. 12 + 188 pp. 16mo, pap., 50 cts.

Sweet (H.) Practical Study of Languages: a guide for learners; with tables and illustrative quotations. New York, *H. Holt & Co.*, 1900. 15 + 280 pp. 12mo, cl., net $1.50.

Taylor (R. L.) Alliteration in Italian. (Yale Diss.) New York, *Lemcke & Buechner*, 1900. 15 + 151 pp. 8vo, pap., net 75 cts.

ENGLISH.

Anthologia Nova Oxoniensis. Transl. into Greek and Latin verse. Edited by R. Ellis and A. D. Godley. London, 1899. 8vo, 290 pp. 6s.

Bleek (W. H. J.) Vocabularies of the Districts of Lourenzo Marques, etc. London, 1899. 4to. 4s.

Hime (H. W. L.) Lucian the Syrian Satirist. London, 1900. 8vo. 5s.

Holmes (T. R.) Caesar's Conquest of Gaul. London, 1899. 8vo, 892 pp. 21s.

Digitized by Google

King (L. W.) Babylonian Religion and Mythology. London, 1899. 8vo, 232 pp. With 12 illustr. 3s. 6d.

Leland (C. G.) The Unpublished Legends of Virgil. London, 1899. 8vo, 228 pp. 6s.

Mau (A.) Pompeii, its Life and Art. Trans. by Fr. W. Kelsey. London, 1899. 8vo, 532 pp. £1 5s.

Poets, Greek Comic. Select Fragments. Edited by A. W. Pickard Cambridge. London, 1899. 8vo. 5s.

Sayce (A. H.) Babylonians and Assyrians: Life and Customs. Edinburgh, 1900. 8vo, x + 273 pp. 5s.

Skeat (W. W.) Malay Magic: Introduction to Folk-lore and Popular Religion of Malay Peninsula. London, 1900. 8vo, 702 pp. 21s.

FRENCH.

Cartault (A.) Étude sur les satires d'Horace. *Alcan.* In-8. 11 fr.

Liet (A.) Traité de prononciation française. Paris, 1900. 8vo, 150 pp. 3 fr.

Maspero (G.) Histoire ancienne des peuples de l'Orient classique. Tome III. Paris, 1899. 8vo. 30 fr.

GERMAN.

Abhandlungen f. die Kunde des Morgenlandes, hrsg. v. der Deutschen morgenländ. Gesellschaft unter der Red. v. E. Windisch. XI. Bd. Nr. 2 u. 3. gr. 8. Leipzig, *F. A. Brockhaus' Sort. in Komm.*—2. Meinhof (Carl). Grundriss e. Lautlehre der Bantusprachen. viii, 245 S. m. 1 farb. Karte. m. 8.—3. Hartmann (Mart.) Lieder der Libyschen Wüste. Die Quellen u. die Texte. vii, 243 S. m. 8.

Alfārābī. Der Musterstaat. Aus dem Arab. v. Frdr. Dieterici. Voran geht die Abhandlg.: "Ueber den Zusammenhang der arab. u. griech. Philosophie." gr. 8. viii, lxxix, 136 S. Leiden, *Buchh. u. Druckerei vorm. E. J. Brill.* m. 5.

Archiv f. celtische Lexikographie. Hrsg. v. Whitley Stokes u. Kuno Meyer. 1. Bd. 3. Hft. gr. 8. S. 325–484 u. 81–112. Halle, *M. Niemeyer.* m. 6.

Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa. 4. Bd. 2. Hälfte. 2. Abtlg. gr. 8. Leipzig, *G. H. Wigand.* m. 12.—4. Alfred's, König, Uebersetzung v. Bedas Kirchengeschichte. Hrsg. v. Jac. Schipper. 2. Hälfte. 2. Abtlg. v, xi–xlv u. S. 513–743 m. 2 Taf. m. 12.

Blaydes (Freder. H. M.) Adversaria critica in Sophoclem, scripsit ac collegit B. gr. 8. iv, 290 S. Halle, *Buchh. des Waisenhauses.* m. 6.

Braune (Wilh.) Die Handschriftenverhältnisse des Nibelungenliedes. [Aus 'Beitr. z. Gesch. d. deut. Sprache u. Litt.'] gr. 8. 222 S. Halle, *M. Niemeyer.* m. 6.

Corpus glossariorum latinorum. Vol. VI. Fasc. II. gr. 8. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.* m. 18.—VI. Thesaurus glossarum emendatarum confecit Geo. Goetz. Pars I. Fasc. II. S. 369–754. m. 18.

Dittenberger (Guilelm.) Sylloge inscriptionum graecarum. Iterum ed. D. Vol. II. gr. 8. v, 825 S. Leipzig, *S. Hirzel.* m. 18.

Gerber (A.) et Greef (A.) Lexicon Taciteum. Fasc. XIV, edidit A. Greef. Lex. 8. S. 1489–1600. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.* m. 3.60.

Digitized by Google

Gliese (Wilh.) Kurze Einführung in das Studium des Gotischen. gr. 8. iv, 103 S. Heidelberg, *C. Winter.* m. 2.

Hildebrandt (Rich.) Beiträge zur Erklärung des Gedichtes Aetna. Progr. 4. 37 S. Leipzig, *Dürr'sche Buchh. in Komm.* m. 1.50.

Holder (Alfr.) Alt-celtischer Sprachschatz. 12. Lfg. gr. 8. Sp. 769–1024. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.* m. 8.

Kunze (Alfr.) Beiträge zur lateinischen Grammatik. I: mea refert. gr. 8. vi, 20 S. Leipzig, *Simmel & Co.* m. 1.

Lautensach (O.) Grammatische Studien zu den griechischen Tragikern u. Komikern. Augment u. Reduplikation. gr. 8. viii, 192 S. Hannover, *Hahn.* m. 4.

Leviticus (F.) Laut- u. Flexionslehre der Sprache der St. Servatiuslegende Heinrichs v. Veldeke. gr. 8. vii, 134 S. m. 3 Tab. Haarlem. Leipzig, *O. Harrassowitz.* m. 5.

Liebenam (W.) Städteverwaltung im römischen Kaiserreiche. gr. 8. xviii, 577 S. Leipzig, *Duncker & Humblot.* m. 4.

Ludwich (Arth.) Textkritische Untersuchungen üb. die mythologischen Scholien zu Homer's Ilias: I. Progr. hoch 4. 28 S. Königsberg, *Akadem. Buchh. v. Schubert & Seidel.* m. —30.

Mémoires de la société finno-ougrienne. XIII u. XIV. gr. 8. Helsingfors. Leipzig, *O. Harrassowitz.*—XIII. Ovigstad (J.) u. Wiklund (K. B.) Bibliographie der lappischen Litteratur. 162 S. m. 4.—XIV. Pipping (Hugo). Zur Phonetik der finnischen Sprache. 236 S. m. 4 Taf. m. 6.

Meurer (H.) Pauli sextani liber. Ed. altera. gr. 8. iv, 172 S. Weimar, *H. Böhlau's Nachf.* m. 1.50.

Müller (C. O.) u. Wieseler (F.) Antike Denkmäler zur griechischen Götterlehre. 4. Ausg. v. Konr. Wernicke. Denkmäler der alten Kunst. II. Tl. 4. Ausg. 2. Lfg. Poseidon. Demeter u. Kore. gr. 8. S. 141–262 m. 10 Taf. in qu. gr. 4. Leipzig, *Dieterich.* m. 5.

Osthoff (Herm.) Vom Suppletivwesen der indogermanischen Sprachen. gr. 4. 95 S. Heidelberg, *A. Wolff in Komm.* m. 4.

Palaestra. Untersuchungen u. Texte aus der deutschen u. engl. Philologie. Hrsg. v. Alois Brandl u. Erich Schmidt. VI u. X. gr. 8. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller.*—VI. Märkisch (Rob.) Die altenglische Bearbeitung der Erzählung v. Apollonius v. Tyrus. Grammatik u. latein. Text. 62 S. m. 1.60.—X. Churchill (George B.) Richard III up to Shakespeare. xiii, 548 S. m. 16.

Palander (H.) Die althochdeutschen Tiernamen. I. Die Namen der Säugetiere. Diss. gr. 8. xv, 71 S. Darmstadt. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller.* m. 4.

Preuner (Erich). Ein delphisches Weihgeschenk. gr. 8. 115 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.* m. 3.20.

Radloff (W.) Die Sprachen der türkischen Stämme. 1. Abth.: Proben der Volkslitteratur. VIII. Thl.: Mundarten der Osmanen. Gesammelt u. übers. v. Ign. Kúnos. gr. 8. ii, xlii, 588 S. St. Petersburg. Leipzig, *Voss' Sort. in Komm.* m. 15.

Ribbeck (Otto). Geschichte der römischen Dichtung. II. Augusteisches Zeitalter. 2. Aufl. gr. 8. vii, 373 S. Stuttgart, *J. G. Cotta Nachf.* m. 8.75.

Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken deutscher Mundarten. Hrsg. v. Otto

Digitized by Google

Bremer. VI. Bd. gr. 8. Leipzig, *Breitkopf & Härtel.*—VI. Weise (Osc.) Syntax der Altenburger Mundart. xii, 164 S. m. 5.

Schleicher's (A. W.) Somali-Texte. Hrsg. v. Leo Reinisch. gr. 8. xx, 159 S. Wien, *A. Hölder.* m. 4.

Schmidt (P. W.) Ueber das Verhältniss der melanesischen Sprachen zu den polynesischen u. untereinander. [Aus 'Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss.'] gr. 8. 93 S. Wien, *C. Gerold's Sohn in Komm.* m. 2.10.

Schöne (Alfr.) Die Weltchronik des Eusebius in ihrer Bearbeitung durch Hieronymus. gr. 8. xiii, 280 S. Berlin, *Weidmann.* m. 8.

Schulthess (Frdr.) Homonyme Wurzeln im Syrischen. gr. 8. xiii, 104 S. Berlin, *Reuther & Reichardt.* m. 4.

Senecae (L. Annaei) opera quae supersunt. Vol. I. Fasc. II. L. Annaei Senecae de beneficiis libri VII, de clementia libri II. Ed. Carol. Hosius. 8. xxvi, 267 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.* m. 2.40.

Silberstein (Emil). Conrad Pellicanus. gr. 8. viii, 104 S. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller.* m. 2.

Stowasser (J. M.) Lateinisch-deutsches Schulwörterbuch. 2. Aufl. Lex. 8. xx, 1104 S. Wien u. Prag, *F. Tempsky.* Leipzig, *G. Freytag.* Bound, m. 11.

Taciti (C. Cornelii) dialogus de oratoribus. Recognovit Alfr. Schöne. gr. 8. iv, 95 S. Dresden (Schumannstr. 44), *A. Schöne.* m. 3.

Tschernjaew (Paul). Terentiana. gr. 8. 17 S. Kasan. Leipzig, *Buchh. G. Fock.* m. 1.50.

Veröffentlichungen, wissenschaftliche, der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft. 1. Hft. Fol. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.*—1. Koldewey (Rob.) Die hettitische Inschrift. Gefunden in der Königsburg v. Babylon am 22. VIII. 1899 u. veröffentlicht. Mit 1 Abbildg. u. 3 Taf. 8 S. m. 4.

Wendel (Carol.) De nominibus bucolicis. [Aus 'Jahrbb. f. class. Philol.'] gr. 8. 90 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.* m. 3.40.

Winckler (Hugo). Altorientalische Forschungen. 2. Reihe. II. Bd. 3. Hft. (XIII. der ganzen Folge). gr. 8. Leipzig, *E. Pfeiffer.*—3. Zu semitischen Inschriften. IV. CIAr 198. V. Manna.—Zur altarab. Zeitrechng.—Der Interrex bei den Sabäern.—Himmel, Kalender u. Mythus.—Die Kanaanäer v. Lagash. iii u. S. 321–400. m. 4.40.

Witte (Guilelm.) De Nicolai Damasceni fragmentorum romanorum fontibus. Diss. gr. 8. 50 S. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller.* m. 1.20.

Zingler (Johs.) De Cicerone historico quaestiones. Diss. gr. 8. iv, 38 S. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller.* m. 1.20.

ITALIAN.

Bonaventura (Arnaldo). La poesia neo-latina in Italia dal secolo XIV al presente. Città di Castello. 16mo, p. 409. L. 4.

De Anna (Luigi). L'articolo nominale e l'articolo verbale nella lingua francese. Milano. 16mo, p. 160. L. 2.

Grünwald-Gatti. Gran dizionario delle lingue italiana e tedesca. 2 voll. Livorno. 4to, p. 1500. L. 25.

Plutarco. Vita di Catone Maggiore a cura di V. Brugnola. Testo e commento. Firenze. 16mo, legato. L. 2.

Pullé. Studi italiani di filologia Indo-Iranica. Vol. III. Pisa. p. 160. L. 15.

Digitized by Google

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Alden (R. M.) The Rise of Formal Satire in England under Classical Influence. (Publications of the University of Pennsylvania. Series in Philology, Literature and Archaeology, vol. VII, no. 2.) Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1899.

Aristotle, The Ethics of, (*Ἠθικὰ Νικομάχεια*). Ed., with an introduction and notes, by John Burnet. London, *Methuen & Co.*, 1900. 15s.

Brugmann (Karl). Der Ursprung der Barytona auf *-σος*. (Abdruck aus den 'Berichten der Königl. Sächs. Gesellsch. der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig,' 14. Nov. 1899.)

Caesaris (C. Iulii) Commentarii De Bello Civili, Schüler-Commentar zu, von Franz Klaschka. 1. Heft, I. u. II. Buch. 2. Heft, III. u. IV. Buch. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1900. @ 1 m. 40 pf. (geb.).

Colin (T. F.) Contes et Sayuètes. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1900.

Cook (A. S.) The Christ of Cynewulf. Ed., with introd., notes and glossary. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1900.

Dante Society, Seventeenth Annual Report of the. McKenzie (K.) Dante's References to Aesop.—Lane (W. C.) Additions to the Dante Collection in the Harvard College Library. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1900.

Demosthenes. On the Peace, Second Philippic, On the Chersonesus, and Third Philippic. With introd. and critical and explanatory notes. By J. E. Sandys. London and New York, *Macmillans*, 1900.

Dictionnaire général de la langue française, par MM. Hatzfeld et Darmesteter avec le concours de M. Thomas. 28. fascicule. Paris, *Delagrave*, 1900. @ 1 fr.

Eckman (George P.) Controversial Elements in Lucretius. (N. Y. Univ. Diss., 1897.) 1899.

Ellis (Robinson). Notes to Varro's R. R. II, III. (Reprint from 'Hermathena,' vol. X, no. XXV.)

Empire of the South (The): An Exposition of the Present Resources and Development of the South, by Frank Presbrey. Published by *The Southern Railway Co.* (W. A. Turk, General Agent, Washington, D. C.), 1899.

English Dictionary (The Oxford). Ed. by J. A. H. Murray. GLASS-COACH–GRADED (Vol. IV). By Henry Bradley.

—— IN–INFER (Vol. V). Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*, 1900. @ $1.25.

Euripides. Andromache. Ed. by A. R. F. Hyslop. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1900.

—— Iphigenia auf Tauris. Herausg. v. Siegfried Reiter. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1900. 1 m. 60 pf. (geb.)

Farquhar (Edward). Elements of Unity in the Homeric Poems. Part I. (Limestone College Studies, I 3.) Gaffney, S. C., *Limestone College Press*, 1900. 5 cts.

Digitized by Google

Fitz Hugh (Thomas). Decennial Report, 1889–1899. School of Latin. University of Texas. Outlines of a System of Classical Pedagogy. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*, 1900.

Fletcher (W. I.) and Bowker (R. R.) The Annual Literary Index, 1899. New York, *Office of the Publishers' Weekly*.

Frisbie (I. F.) The Beginner's Greek Book. Boston, *E. E. Babb & Co.*, 1898.

Gower, The Complete Works of. Edited from the MSS, with introductions, notes and glossaries. By G. C. Macaulay. The French Works. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1899. For sale by Cushing & Co., Baltimore.

Gray (Louis H.) The Indo-Iranian Deity Apam Napat. (Separat-Abdruck aus 'Archiv für Religionswissenschaft.') Tübingen, *Mohr*, 1900.

—— Parallels in Pali and New Persian Phonology. (From the 'Journal of the American Oriental Society, XX, 1899, pp. 229–43.)

Hanssen (Friedrich). Zur spanischen u. portugiesischen Metrik. (Separatabzug aus den 'Verhandlungen des Deutschen wissenschaftlichen Vereins in Santiago, Bd. IV.) Valparaiso, *Guillermo Hermann*, 1900.

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology. Vol. X. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1899.

Hempl (George). Origin of the Latin Letters *G* and *Z*. (Extract 'Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc.,' vol. XXX, 1899.)

Johnson (C. W. L.) The Motion of the Voice in the Theory of Ancient Music. (Extract from 'Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc.,' vol. XXX, 1899.)

Keelhoff (J.) Revue de Riemann et Goelzer, Syntaxe comparée. (Revue de l'Instruction publique en Belgique, XLIII, 1e liv., 1900.)

King (L. W.) Babylonian Religion and Mythology. London, *Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.* New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1899.

Klaschka (Franz). Schülerkommentar zu Ciceros Cato Maior de Senectute. 70 pf.

—— Schülerkommentar zu Ciceros Laelius de Amicitia. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1900. 80 pf.

Knauth (Hermann). Uebungsstücke zum Uebersetzen in das Lateinische für Abiturienten. 3. Aufl. Leipzig, *Freytag*, 1900. 1 m. 50 pf.

Kurrelmeyer (William). The Historical Development of the Types of First Plural Imperative in German. (J. H. U. Diss.) Strassburg, *Trübner*, 1900.

Liden (Evald). Studien zur altindischen u. vergleichenden Sprachgeschichte. Leipzig, *O. Harrassowitz*, 1897.

Livi (T.) Ab urbe condita liber XXXXV. Herausg. v. Wilhelm Krüger, mit erkl. Anmerkungen. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1900. 90 pf.

Modern Language Association of America, Publications of the. Ed. by J. W. Bright. Vol. XV, No. 1. (N. S., Vol. VIII, No. 1.) I. The Lambeth Version of Havelock. By E. K. Putnam.—II. La Vie de Ste. Catherine d'Alexandrie. By H. A. Todd.—III. Philology and Purism. By H. C. G. v. Jagemann.—IV. Interpretative Syntax. By C. Alphonso Smith.—V. Influence of the Court Masques on the Drama, 1608–15. By A. H. Thorndike. Baltimore, *The Association*, 1900.

Mohl (F. Geo.) Les Origines Romanes. Étude sur le lexique du Latin

Digitized by Google

vulgaire. (Mémoire de la Société royale des Sciences de Bohème.) Prague, 1900.

Muret-Sanders. Encyclopädisches Wörterbuch der englischen u. deutschen Sprache. Teil II: Deutsch–Englisch. Lfg. 15: Linie-halten–mörderhaft. Vollst. in 24 Lfgn. N. Y., *International News Co.* @ 1 m. 50 pf.

Nepos (Cornelius), Weidner's Schulwörterbuch zu. Bearb. v. J. Schmidt. 2te Aufl., mit 85 Abbildgn. Leipzig, *Freytag*, 1900. 2 m.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte u. deutsche Altertümer u. für Paedagogik. III. Jahr. V. u. VI. Bdes. 2. u. 3. Heft. Leipzig, *Teubner*, 1900.

Oliver (Andrew). Observations on the Use of Certain Prepositions in Petronius, with special reference to the Roman Sermo Plebeius. San Francisco, 1899.

Osgood (Charles Grosvenor, Jr.) The Classical Mythology of Milton's English Poems. (Yale Studies in English—Albert S. Cook, Editor—VIII.) New York, *Henry Holt & Co.*, 1900.

Osthoff (Hermann). Vom Suppletivwesen der indogermanischen Sprachen. Erweiterte akademische Rede. Heidelberg, *Alfred Wolff*, 1900.

Perrot (Georges). Value to History of the Study of the Fine Arts. Translated and annotated by D. Cady Eaton. (Reprinted from 'Popular Science Monthly,' Dec. 1899.)

Plautus, The Captivi of. Ed., with notes and stage-directions, by G. E. Barber. Boston, *B. H. Sanborn & Co.*, 1900.

Prince (J. Dyneley). Some Passamaquoddy Witchcraft Tales. The Passamaquoddy Wampum Records. Some Passamaquoddy Documents. (Reprints from 'Annals N. Y. Academy of Sciences,' 1897–99.)

Renard (Mme. Georges). Trois Contes de Noël. Ed. by F. Th. Meylan. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1900.

Revue des Humanités en Belgique. Publication trimestrielle. Janv. 1900. Hasselt. *La Rédaction.* 5 fr. un an.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Hrsg. v. Bücheler u. Usener. N. F. LV, 1 u. 2. Frankfurt a. M., *Sauerländer*, 1900.

Sanskrit-English Dictionary (A). Etymologically and philologically arranged with special reference to cognate Indo-European languages. By Sir Monier Monier-Williams. New ed., greatly enlarged and improved with the collaboration of Prof. E. Leumann (Strassburg) and C. Capeller (Jena), and other scholars. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press.* London, Edinburgh, New York, *Henry Frowde*, 1900. Cloth, $18.40.

Schöne (Alfred). Die Weltchronik des Eusebius in ihrer Bearbeitung durch Hieronymus. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1900. 8 m.

Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis. Lucreti De Rerum Natura Libri Sex. Recogn. Cyrillus Bailey. 3s.

—— Platonis Opera. Tom. I. Tetralogiae I–II. Recogn. J. Burnet. 6s.

—— Taciti Opera Minora. Recogn. H. Furneaux. 2s.

—— Thucydidis Historiae. Tom. I. Libri I–IV. Recogn. H. Stuart Jones. 3s. 6d. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press.* New York, *Henry Frowde*, 1900.

Sihler (E. G.) The Treatise περὶ ὕψους. (Extract from 'Proceedings of the Am. Phil. Assoc.,' vol. XXX, 1899.)

Digitized by Google

Smith (C. Alphonso). Interpretative Syntax. (Reprint from 'Trans. M. L. Assoc.') Baltimore, 1900.

Smyth (Herbert Weir). Greek Melic Poets. London and New York, *Macmillan*, 1900.

Spofford (Ainsworth R.) The Coming of the White Man and the Founding of the National Capital. (Proceedings of the Washington Academy of Sciences, January 18, 1900.) Washington, D. C., *The Academy*, 1900.

Tacitus. Agricola. Ed. by Alfred Gudeman. Boston, *Allyn & Bacon*, 1900. $1.

Verlags-Katalog. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1900.

West (A. F.) Is there a Democracy of Studies? (Reprinted from 'The Atlantic Monthly' for December, 1899.)

Wilhelm (Adolf). ἔτος and ἐνιαυτός. (Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Bd. CXLII.) Wien, *Carl Gerold's Sohn*, 1900.

—— Ein Brief der Kaiserin Plotina. Simonideische Gedichte. (Sonderabdrücke aus den 'Jahresheften des österreichischen archäologischen Institutes,' Bd. II, 1899.)

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

VOL. XXI, 2 WHOLE NO. 82

OCT 4 1900

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY

BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE

PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

BALTIMORE: THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
LONDON: KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & CO.
LEIPSIC: F. A. BROCKHAUS

APRIL, MAY, JUNE
1900

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS.

I.—Horace, Serm. I 4: A Protest and a Programme. By G. L. Hendrickson, ... 121

II.—Tennyson and Homer. By Wilfred P. Mustard, . . . 143

III.—Prohibitives in Silver Latin. By Willard K. Clement, . . 154

IV.—Notes on Servius. By R. B. Steele, ... 170

V.—Etymological Miscellany. By Francis A. Wood, . . . 178

VI.—Some Lucretian Emendations. By W. A. Merrill, . . . 183

VII.—Some Celtic Traces in the Glosses. By Otto B. Schlutter, . 188

VIII.—The Source of the So-called Achaean-Doric κοινή. By Carl Darling Buck, ... 193

IX.—Etymology and Slang. By Edwin W. Fay, ... 197

Review: 200
Patin's Parmenides im Kampfe gegen Heraklit.

Reports: 217
Revue de Philologie.—Englische Studien.

Brief Mention, ... 229

Recent Publications, ... 236

Books Received, ... 239

Open to original communications in all departments of philology, classical, comparative, oriental, modern; condensed reports of current philological work; summaries of chief articles in the leading philological journals of Europe; reviews by specialists; bibliographical lists. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price $3.00 a year, payable to the publisher in advance; single numbers, $1.00 each. Suitable advertisements will be inserted at the following rates:

	1 time.	2 t.	3 t.	4 t.
One page	$16 00	$30 00	$40 00	$50 00
Half page	8 00	15 00	20 00	25 00
Quarter page	4 00	8 00	12 00	15 00
Eighth page	2 00	4 00	6 00	8 00

The English Agents of the American Journal of Philology are Messrs. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Paternoster House, Charing Cross Road, London, W. C.

Special Notice.—The stock of complete sets of The American Journal of Philology has passed over into the hands of the undersigned. These sets will be sold for the present at the regular price, $60 for the twenty volumes, cash to accompany the order. Single volumes, $3; single numbers, $1 each, so far as they can be supplied. Address

The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

Published quarterly. Three dollars a year (postage paid). Entered at the Postoffice of Baltimore, Md., as second-class matter.

Press of The Friedenwald Co.
Baltimore, Md.

Digitized by Google

OCT 4 19

AMERICAN

JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXI, 2. WHOLE NO. 82.

I.—HORACE, SERM. I 4: A PROTEST AND A PROGRAMME.

Mr. Furness, in the preface to his edition of Othello, has quoted a passage from the lectures of the Edinburgh anatomist, Dr. Barclay, which by its frank avowal seems as if written to ease the heart of the late-born classical student who essays to present new points of view concerning the work of an author to whom such long and such devoted study has been given as to Horace. Like Dr. Barclay's anatomists, so our heroic scholars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are "the reapers, who entering upon untrodden ground, cut down great store of corn from all sides of them.... Then come the gleaners who gather up ears enough from the bare ridges to make a few loaves of bread. Last of all come the geese, who still continue to pick up a few grains scattered here and there among the stubble, and waddle home in the evening, poor things, cackling with joy because of their success." If the illustration seem to any one too apt for prudence, he may derive comfort from the assurances of the anatomical specialists, that anatomy had not so nearly exhausted its field at the beginning of the present century as the good Dr. Barclay believed. But still it is apposite enough to justify the scepticism of any audience asked to listen to a new interpretation of a whole poem of Horace. It is therefore with some hesitation that I venture to advance an explanation of the meaning and purpose of the composition named in my title at variance with current opinion—an explanation which, if sound, is not without significance for the

Digitized by Google

whole question of Horace's relation to Lucilius and to the history and theory of satire.[1]

In the second poem of the first book, the earliest specimen of the poet's work in this field which he allowed to survive, it is clear that Horace had undertaken to write satire in the tradition of the form established by Lucilius. It reveals a coarseness and a freedom of speech essentially analogous to the manner of his great predecessor. As yet Horace was a free lance in Roman society, unembarrassed by important friendships and unconcerned for possible enmities. But after all, coarseness and cynicism were not the natural expression of his nature, which was gentle and refined, and it is probable that the force of literary tradition led him to forms of expression and criticism which violated his own inclinations and tendencies.[2]

In the third poem of this book Horace has freed himself from any constraint of the tradition of satire, and with a growing independence, based upon his own nature and the confidence inspired by influential friendships, he presents as a satirist a wholly different front. In this work he begins, to be sure, in the censorious manner of satire, with a review of the character of Tigellius, but passes at once to a sharp censure of such ill-natured criticism, making his own example the text of a plea for kindly tolerance of the faults of others, which shall err rather on the side of indulgence.[3] The tone and spirit of this composition are as much at

[1] A complete presentation of my view involves a treatment of portions of Serm. I 10 also, which will appear in a subsequent number of this Journal.

[2] An interesting analogy is the statement of Cicero that the *reprehensio vitae*, in the prosecution of Murena (11), ita fuit infirma et levis, ut illos *lex* magis quaedam *accusatoria* quam *vera male dicendi facultas* de vita L. Murenae dicere aliquid *coegerit*. In verse 65 ff. of the fourth satire Horace compares the satirist as usually thought of to the prosecutor (see below, p. 131).

[3] Nothing can be weaker than the current interpretation of the old puzzle in vs. 20 *et fortasse minora*, which admonishes the reader that the emphasis lies on *fortasse*, i. e. 'perhaps less, *perhaps* also greater.' One need not wonder, therefore, that Hertz and L. Müller have gone back to Aldus' once popular conjecture, *haud fortasse*. But *et* is right and perfectly clear if the whole connection is grasped. Horace begins in a censorious vein of petty personal criticism. When upbraided with the question *quid? tu | nullane habes vitia?* still playing the rôle of critic, he replies in feeble self-apology, *et fortasse minora*. The situation is relieved of all uncertainty by the illustration which follows. Maenius (who corresponds to Horace) assails the absent Novius (who plays the rôle of Tigellius), and when reproved by some one present, answers in weak defence, *egomet mi ignosco*, which in turn is the equivalent of *et fortasse*

Digitized by Google

variance with the tradition of satire established by Lucilius and with Horace's first essay as can well be imagined. The personal allusions too, so far as can be determined, are rather literary than real. Thus near the beginning of the poet's career we see him repenting of the tone which his first work had assumed and repudiating the function which criticism had assigned to this branch of composition.

That brings us to the fourth satire, in which, apparently, the poet feels obliged to defend himself against the numerous enmities his verse had made. Kirchner, in accordance with the usual interpretation, entitles his translation "the poet's justification," and Kiessling says (Introduction) that Horace defends himself, on the one hand, against those who denied to satire the character of true poetry, by showing that Lucilius and himself derived their spirit from the inspired old comedy; and, on the other hand, against the philistinism of the day, which felt itself assailed by his satire, and therefore hated the satirist. Now, as we have seen, Horace had written one poem which might have given rise to some such feelings. But we shall find it hard to believe that this one composition of an author hitherto unknown should have succeeded in arousing such bitter hatred as we must assume was the case, if we are to interpret the hostile criticism which the poem reflects as directed against Horace in person. This and other related difficulties were felt by Kirchner, and accordingly (Einl., p. 15, vol. I), contrary to the generally accepted conclusions of scholars before and since his time, he placed this and the related tenth satire after all the other compositions of this book, and after the third of book two. That Kirchner was in error in advancing the date of composition so far scarcely requires proof. But he deserves credit for observing that this satire, as usually interpreted, is hardly conceivable near the beginning of the poet's career.

We have already seen that in the third poem Horace has revealed a nature of kindly tolerance and has raised a protest against carping criticism of personal faults and peculiarities. It

minora. The vigorous censure which follows—*stultus et improbus hic amor est dignusque notari*—is aimed primarily at Horace's own apology, although attached immediately to the apology of Maenius. Vss. 1–24 give an objective example of the carping criticism against which the remainder of the satire is directed. The observation that *et fortasse minora* and *egomet mi ignosco* must correspond, quite excludes the reading *haud fortasse.*

Digitized by Google

shows how little sympathy he must have had with the conception of satire which prevailed among his contemporaries. This conception is known to us from other sources, and is formulated in the definition preserved by Diomedes (G. L. I, p. 485), derived from a source certainly as early as Varro: *carmen maledicum ad carpenda vitia hominum archaeae comoediae charactere compositum.* It was therefore not unnatural that, finding himself pursuing a form of composition in a spirit at variance with the traditions of its character, its origin, and the practice of his predecessors, he should at an early stage in his work turn his attention to the theory of satire current in his time, and declare his attitude toward it. This he does in the present poem, the first part of which is a protest against the traditional idea of the character and function of satire, while the second part sets forth his own conception of his task. I do not believe that Horace is here justifying himself before the harsh criticisms of a public which felt aggrieved and injured by his attacks, nor do I believe that the contents of the satire and the criticisms of himself which it presents are drawn from life. *It is, on the contrary, a criticism of literary theory put concretely.* The charges of an imaginary critic, describing Horace as an envenomed and unsparing satirist—in terms such as literary criticism employed concerning Lucilius or Aristophanes—give the poet opportunity to utter his protest against this character which tradition had attributed to satire. His positive programme is touched on but lightly. It is drawn throughout with conspicuous antithesis to the qualities which were attributed to Lucilius or to the idea of satire as abstracted from his career. Before approaching the detailed analysis, let me remind the reader that it will not be admissible to quote the first satire of the second book against the results which have been thus outlined; for Horace, in the face of literary and social success, was able to be much more generous with Lucilius and more tolerant of his admirers than we find him here and in the tenth poem of this book.

I have called the first part of this poem a protest against the prevalent conception of satire and the character thus attributed to the satirist. This is the central theme, and is defined by the poet very sharply in vs. 64: *nunc illud tantum quaeram, meritone tibi sit || suspectum genus hoc scribendi.* His object is to show, in the first place, why this suspicion is entertained, and, in the second place, to disclaim the applicability of such a conception of satire

Digitized by Google

to himself and to his work as he proposes to practice it. He begins, therefore, with the history of satire as literary critics of his time and before him had defined it,[1] and thus explains why *genus hoc minime iuvat* (vs. 24).

> Eupolis atque Cratinus Aristophanesque poetae
> atque alii, quorum comoedia prisca virorum est,
> siquis erat dignus describi, quod malus ac fur,
> quod moechus foret aut sicarius aut alioqui
> famosus, multa cum libertate notabant.

Here it will be observed that the old comedy is characterized, not in all of its manifestations, but only in those which made it the dreaded scourge of evil-doers in its day (cf. treatise *περὶ κωμῳδίας* V (Dübner), v. 21 ff.). When Horace continues, therefore,

> Hinc omnis pendet Lucilius, hosce secutus
> mutatis tantum pedibus numerisque, facetus,
> emunctae naris, durus componere versus,

we are only justified in interpreting these words to mean that Lucilius is the faithful disciple of the writers of the old comedy in this one respect, viz. aggressive, censorious wit. That we may not infer more from this passage is made clear from the fact that further on in this poem, and also in I 10, Horace emphasizes the failure of Lucilius to reproduce some other desirable elements of the old comedy, and thus fell short of his model and short of the ideal. For Aristophanes and his compeers were poets (vs. 1); Lucilius is not (vs. 57). The old comedy was strong in playful jest as well as cutting wit (I 10, 11 and 17); Lucilius has only the latter. While, to be sure, he is praised for that (*quod sale multo || urbem defricuit . . . laudatur*, I 10, 4), still Horace says expressly in that connection *nec tamen hoc tribuens dederim quoque cetera* (ib. 5).[2] It is therefore essential to keep in mind that Horace here means to limit sharply Lucilius' indebtedness to the old comedy to that quality which made Cratinus and Aristophanes feared and hated in their time, and which, as practised by Lucilius, had caused people to look with suspicion and fear upon satire. It will now be clear why Horace begins as he does: the old comedy

[1] That the association of Lucilius with the old comedy antedates Horace (contrary to the view of Kiessling and others) Leo has made clear, Varro und die Satire, Hermes, vol. 24 (1889), p. 67 ff. Additional evidence to the same effect from Horace himself I shall adduce in connection with Serm. I 10, 17.

[2] On this point see further the detailed interpretation of I 10 init.

Digitized by Google

was conspicuous for its aggressive, relentless wit; Lucilius followed it in this respect, and hence from that time all who call themselves satirists are regarded with suspicion. But the connection between the history of satire and the conclusion, *sunt quos genus hoc minime iuvat* (vs. 24), is obscured by the digression on the style of Lucilius, which Horace introduces apropos of the words *durus componere versus.*

Nam fuit hoc vitiosus: in hora saepe ducentos,
ut magnum, versus dictabat stans pede in uno;
cum flueret lutulentus, erat quod tollere velles;
garrulus atque piger scribendi ferre laborem,
scribendi recte, nam ut multum nil moror. Ecce
Crispinus minimo me provocat 'accipe, si vis,
accipiam tabulas; detur nobis locus, hora,
custodes, videamus uter plus scribere possit.'

This censure is very sharp, for not only must Lucilius bear the brunt of what Horace puts upon him directly, but also the odium of the comparison with the prolific Crispinus. And we may well believe that Horace, in contemplating the thirty muddy books of his predecessor, could say with grateful heart

Di bene fecerunt, inopis me quodque pusilli
finxerunt animi, raro et perpauca loquentem.
At tu conclusas hircinis follibus auras
usque laborantis, dum ferrum molliat ignis,
ut mavis, imitare.

But in alluding to the form of Lucilius, Horace has digressed from his main purpose, though not without design and implied contrast of his own ideal of careful execution. He now returns to his argument with the insertion of another comparison.

Beatus Fannius ultro
delatis capsis et imagine, cum mea nemo
scripta legat, volgo recitare timentis ob hanc rem,
quod sunt quos genus hoc minime iuvat, utpote pluris
culpari dignos.

The transition is made abrupt by the familiar Horatian inversion which places an illustration or a comparison before that which it is meant to illustrate, and gives it independent form, as if a thing adduced for its own sake.[1] But the connection may be traced

[1] The observation of this habit affords the explanation of many seemingly disconnected parts of the Ars Poetica.

Digitized by Google

easily thus: Lucilius wrote too much, and the challenge to vie with him I must reject, as I do that of the prolific Crispinus. And, thank heaven, I speak but little and not often; and that little no one reads, since I would not proffer my books to be read, as the complacent Fannius does, and I am afraid to recite them myself, *quod genus hoc* etc.

> Quemvis media elige turba
> aut ob avaritiam aut misera ambitione laborat;
> hic nuptarum insanit amoribus, hic puerorum;
> hunc capit argenti splendor, stupet Albius aere;
> hic mutat mercis surgente a sole ad eum, quo
> vespertina tepet regio, quin per mala praeceps
> fertur, uti pulvis collectus turbine, nequid
> summa deperdat metuens aut ampliet ut rem:
> omnes hi metuunt versus, odere poetas.

They think of the satirist as a harsh and unsparing wit who uses the weapons of invective and personal abuse to make conspicuous any one whom his fancy strikes.

> 'Faenum habet in cornu, longe fuge: dummodo risum
> excutiat tibi, non hic cuiquam parcet amico
> et quodcumque semel chartis inleverit, omnis
> gestiet a furno redeuntis scire lacuque
> et pueros et anus.'

But why is this opinion held? Has Horace in fact been so unsparing in his attacks that he has provoked the whole city to fear and hate? Obviously not, and I have said enough to make it clear that these words are only a concrete picture of the general conception of satire itself as already formulated in the poet's time, to combat which is the object of this composition. Accordingly, this description is only a somewhat exaggerated form of language actually applied to the slashing wit of the old comedy (and its precursors, the early iambic poets) or the unsparing spirit of Lucilius. The humorous description of the satirist as an infuriated bull was conventional in this sphere of literature, as we may conjecture from Horace's comparison of himself to Archilochus (in Epod. 6, 11): *in malos asperrimus* || *parata tollo cornua,* || *qualis Lycambae spretus infido gener.*[1] To the same class belongs the warning to flee the poet, as armed with dangerous

[1] The same comparison underlies the choice of the illustration in Serm. II 1, 52: dente lupus, cornu taurus petit. Similarly *dens*; cf. Epod. 6, 15: *atro dente*, and Persius (of Lucilius) 1, 115: et *genuinum* fregit in illis.

Digitized by Google

weapons.[1] The satirist thus armed and an object of terror may remind us of Juvenal's perfervid picture (I 165): *ense velut stricto quotiens Lucilius ardens* || *infremuit* etc., or of the attacks of Cratinus ὥσπερ δημοσία μάστιξ (π. κωμ. V). In the words *dummodo risum* || *excutiat tibi non hic cuiquam parcet amico* Horace has reproduced a statement of the ungentlemanly or illiberal form of jest as defined by Aristotle, who illustrated such witticism by the example of the old comedy. For the satirist, as Horace finds that people conceive of him, is none other than the coarse and inconsiderate βωμολόχος whom Aristotle describes (Eth. Nic. IV 14, 1128a36): οὔτε ἑαυτοῦ οὔτε τῶν ἄλλων ἀπεχόμενος, εἰ γέλωτα ποιήσει. The difference, he continues, between the jest of the βωμολόχος and the εὐτράπελος is such as would distinguish the jest of a slave from that of a gentleman, or of an uncultivated man from that of a cultivated man. The former is illustrated by the old comedy, in which the means of provoking laughter is αἰσχρολογία (coarseness and abuse), the latter by the new comedy, where the effect is produced by ὑπόνοια (innuendo). Later special writers περὶ γελοίου[2] defined more accurately the proper limits of jest, following the general lines of Aristotle's treatment. So, for example, in Cicero (De orat. II 237) we find that the Aristotelian οὔτε ἑαυτοῦ οὔτε τῶν ἄλλων ἀπεχόμενος has been given a special application: *parcendum maxime est caritati hominum, ne temere in eos dicas qui diliguntur*, or as he says again in the Orator, 89: *parcet amicitiis*, which approaches our verse most closely—*non hic cuiquam parcet amico*. Again, in contrast to the εἴρων, whose jest is for his own amusement, the βωμολόχος seeks some ulterior aim of abuse or defamation: ἔστι δὲ ἡ εἰρωνεία τῆς βωμολοχίας ἐλευθεριώτερον· ὁ μὲν γὰρ αὑτοῦ ἕνεκα ποιεῖ τὸ γελοῖον, ὁ δὲ βωμολόχος ἑτέρου (Rhet. III 18 ad fin.). So here Horace causes the satirist to be described as not content till the very children of the streets have heard his outpourings. We see, therefore, that the picture which Horace draws of the satirist, as people think of him, corresponds to Aristotle's characterization of the βωμολοχία which he found exemplified by the old comedy, and to such terms as are used to describe iambic and satirical poets generally.

[1] Cf. the epigram on Hipponax (Anthol. Pal. VII 405): ὦ ξεῖνε φεῦγε τὸν χαλαζεπῆ τάφον | τὸν φρικτὸν Ἱππώνακτος.

[2] Whom Cicero makes use of in De orat. II 235 and refers to (*qui pollicerentur*).

Digitized by Google

Agedum pauca accipe contra.
Primum ego me illorum, dederim quibus esse poetas,
excerpam numero; neque enim concludere versum
dixeris esse satis neque, siqui scribat uti nos
sermoni propiora, putes hunc esse poetam;
ingenium cui sit, cui mens divinior atque os
magna sonaturum des nominis huius honorem,
Idcirco quidam, comoedia necne poema
esset, quaesivere quod acer spiritus ac vis
nec verbis nec rebus inest, nisi quod pede certo
differt sermoni, sermo merus. 'At pater ardens
saevit, quod meretrice nepos insanus amica
filius uxorem grandi cum dote recuset,
ebrius et magnum quod dedecus ambulet ante
noctem cum facibus.' Numquid Pomponius istis
audiret leviora, pater si viveret? ergo
non satis est puris versum perscribere verbis,
quem si dissolvas, quivis stomachetur eodem
quo personatus pacto pater. His, ego quae nunc,
olim quae scripsit Lucilius, eripias si
tempora certa modosque et quod prius ordine verbum est
posterius facias, praeponens ultima primis—
non ut si solvas 'postquam Discordia taetra
belli ferratos postis portasque refregit'—
invenias etiam disiecti membra poetae.

With these words the poet begins his rejoinder. To many scholars this episode has seemed a mere digressive quibble. That it is, however, a vital part of Horace's protest will, I think, appear. In the first place it is probable that Roman criticism of Lucilius, in emphasizing his relation to the old comedy, had (as we shall see further, on I 10, 12: *modo rhetoris atque poetae*) attributed to him poetical qualities which only belonged to the Attic masters with whom he was associated, and in other ways had exaggerated the poetical character of his work.[1] It is, I believe, against such a conception of the nature of satirical form that Horace here protests, affirming that so far from laying claim to the title of poet for himself, he expressly repudiates it. 'It is not enough to write mere prose in metrical feet to entitle one to that designation, and for the same reason some have questioned whether comedy was poetry or not.' The comedy referred to is not, of course, the ἀρχαία, as some interpreters have thought, misled by the allusions to this form at the beginning. It is

[1] Cf. L. Müller, Leben und Werke d. G. Lucilius, p. 20: "Lucilius nimmt zuweilen, öfter als Horaz, höheren dichterischen Schwung."

Digitized by Google

comoedia κατ' ἐξοχήν, i. e. the *νέα*, as the example plainly shows. In fact, as Horace desires to repudiate for himself association with the aggressive *spirit* of the old comedy, so in like manner he has entered into this discussion for the sake of repudiating all claim to the character of true poetry which such association would suggest, and which, apparently, criticism had attributed to Lucilius. He is therefore careful to say emphatically that the writers of the old comedy were poets—*Eupolis atque Cratinus Aristophanesque poetae*—for the sake of setting over against this his own disavowal. The old comedy possessed the *ingenium*, the *mens divinior*, the *os magna sonaturum*[1] of true poetry—*ἡ δὲ παλαιὰ (ἔχει) τὸ δεινὸν καὶ ὑψηλὸν τοῦ λόγου* (*π. κωμ.* V, v. 7). Satire, on the other hand, like the new comedy (and the *μέση*), only aims to versify the language of everyday life.[2] In denying to Lucilius as well as to himself (vs. 57) the character of true poetry, we may discern (as I have already said) a criticism directed against those admirers of Lucilius who attributed to him the qualities of elevated poetry which they found in Aristophanes and Cratinus. They were poets, Horace says, I am not; no more was Lucilius, and his only relation to them is his emulation of their great license of speech.

[1] A point of detailed interpretation in passing. The editors, I believe, look upon these words (43) as an enumeration of three qualities essential to true poetry. Horace's thought, however, is this: poetry is a matter of genius (*ingenium*) which manifests itself (1) in the inspired thought (*mens divinior*) and (2) in elevation of language (*os magna sonaturum*). It is the customary division of Greek literary criticism into the *τόπος πραγματικός* and *λεκτικός* (cf. Dion. Hal. de Dem., ch. 31 and passim). *Ingenium* belongs to and comprehends both. That the poet has this division in mind becomes obvious at vs. 47: quod acer spiritus ac vis ‖ nec verbis (*λέξις*) nec rebus (*πράγματα*) inest. On *os* in the meaning 'style' cf. Persius in allusion to this passage (v. p. 139), 5, 15: *ore teres modico*, and cf. the similar use of *στόμα* in Greek; e. g. Dion. Hal. de Lysiâ, ch. 15: *τὸ Δυσιακὸν στόμα*.

[2] There are some conspicuous points of analogy here to the Greek criticism of the middle and new comedy which are worth pointing out. For example, like Horace, the poets of the middle comedy did not aim at poetical invention: *τῆς δὲ μέσης κωμῳδίας οἱ ποιηταὶ πλάσματος μὲν οὐχ ἥψαντο ποιητικοῦ, διὰ δὲ τῆς συνήθους ἰόντες λαλιᾶς λογικὰς ἔχουσι τὰς ἀρετάς* (neque . . . siqui scribat uti nos ‖ sermoni propiora), *ὥστε σπάνιον ποιητικὸν εἶναι χαρακτῆρα παρ' αὐτοῖς* (putes hunc esse poetam). Similarly Aristotle, in contrast to the high-flown, poetical language of the old comedy, demanded that the *κωμικὴ λέξις* should be *κοινὴ καὶ ὀημώδης* (Coislinian treatise *π. κωμ.*, §7, and Bernays' comment, Ergänzung zu Arist. Poetik, p. 165).

Digitized by Google

Hactenus haec: alias iustum sit necne poema.
Nunc illud tantum quaeram, meritone tibi sit
suspectum genus hoc scribendi. Sulcius acer
ambulat et Caprius, rauci male cumque libellis,
magnus uterque timor latronibus; at bene siquis
et vivat puris manibus, contemnat utrumque.
Ut sis tu similis Caeli Birrique latronum,
non ego sim Capri neque Sulci: cur metuas me?
Nulla taberna meos habeat neque pila libellos,
quis manus insudet volgi Hermogenisque Tigelli,
nec recito cuiquam nisi amicis idque coactus,
non ubivis coramve quibuslibet. In medio qui
scripta foro recitent sunt multi quique lavantes,
suave locus voci resonat conclusus. Inanis
hoc iuvat, haud illud quaerentis, num sine sensu,
tempore num faciant alieno.

With these words Horace reverts to his main theme. The idea that the satirist, *qua* satirist, can have but the one purpose of ill-natured criticism is again taken up and answered by a comparison. 'You seem to think of the writer of satire very much as the thief thinks of the zealous prosecutors Sulcius and Caprius. But the man with clean hands need not fear them; how much less then need you fear me, for, though you should take the rôle of thief, I disclaim that of prosecutor.' It was, of course, the career of Lucilius which gave form and currency to the conception of satire which the poet disavows. For Lucilius had been in his day nothing less than a public prosecutor—*primores populi arripuit populumque tributim* (II 1, 69) just to be sure (ib. 70), but with a keen scent (*emunctae naris*) to ferret out the wrong and to unmask it—*detrahere et pellem, nitidus qua quisque per ora* || *cederet, introrsum turpis* (II 1, 63). In this regard he followed closely the example of his Attic masters (π. κωμ. I, v. 35): σκοπουῦ γὰρ ὄντος τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμῳδίας τοῦ σκώπτειν (*arripuit*) δήμους (*populum tributim*) καὶ δικαστὰς καὶ στρατηγούς (*primores populi*). For this view of comedy as a beneficent factor in Athenian life see the treatises *passim* (e. g. V, v. 20). It is possible that from such sources the same claim of the performance of a public service had been transferred to Lucilius by Roman critics, and so had entered into the theory of satire. But, at all events, it is clearly opposed to the ideals and practice of Horace, and he makes use of the Roman hatred of the voluntary prosecutor to put this conception in an odious light.[1] So far from seeking out objects of attack or

[1] For the analogy of the task of the prosecutor to that of the satirist, see the interesting passage from Cicero quoted above, p. 122, note.

Digitized by Google

publicity for his work, his books are not on sale, nor does he read them to any but his friends, and to them only under compulsion.

78 'Laedere gaudes'
inquit 'et hoc studio pravus facis.'

Resuming his main theme, the poet puts into the mouth of an imaginary enemy these words, descriptive of himself. But nowhere is it clearer that the purpose of the hostile criticism which Horace causes to be directed against himself is to characterize the satirist in the abstract, in accordance with the received theory of satire. For tradition and criticism had ruled that it is the function of satire to hurt, as it had been of the old comedy, which declined with the loss of this privilege—*turpiter obticuit sublato iure nocendi* (A. P. 284).[1] For satire this view is expressed in its most general form by Trebatius, who contrasts with it the worthier task of singing the deeds of Caesar: *quanto rectius hoc* (sc. *Caesaris res dicere*) *quam tristi laedere versu* etc. (II 1, 21). But it is an unworthy ambition of coarse wits (βωμολόχοι), as Aristotle had pointed out (l. c., 1128a6): μᾶλλον στοχαζόμενοι τοῦ γέλωτα ποιεῖν ἢ τοῦ λέγειν εὐσχήμονα καὶ μὴ λυπεῖν (*laedere, nocere*) τὸν σκωπτόμενον. Later criticism, however, not sharing Aristotle's hostility to the old comedy, and seeking to give theoretical justification to the coarse forms of wit it displayed, frankly recognized βωμολοχία as a merit in comic and iambic poetry.[2] So, for example, the Coislinian treatise περὶ κωμῳδίας, putting as a requisite of comedy exactly what Aristotle condemned, says (Bernays, §5): ὁ σκώπτων ἐλέγχειν θέλει ἁμαρτήματα τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ τοῦ σώματος[3]—words which also

[1] *Turpiter* is, I think, to be taken with *nocendi*, i. e. (in language such as Aristotle might have used of the old comedy) αἰσχρολογίᾳ λυπεῖν. The position would associate it as naturally with *nocendi* as with *obticuit*. For the phraseology and thought, cf. Cic. De orat. II 236: haec enim ridentur vel sola vel maxime, quae *notant* et designant turpitudinem *non turpiter*. But this is an ideal standpoint which the old comedy did not live up to, and it was conspicuous for its freedom *notare turpiter*, or as here *nocere turpiter*.

[2] If this seem incredible to any one, let him remember that Horace himself, with certain limitations, concedes it (I 10, 8): *et est quaedam hic quoque virtus* (sc. *risu diducere rictum auditoris*). See further on p. 141.

[3] With this compare Cicero, De orat. II 239: est etiam deformitatis et corporis vitiorum satis bella materies ad iocandum—a statement which Cicero limits rather sharply, to be sure, but which, nevertheless, marks a retrogression from the standpoint of Aristotle. Cf. also p. 139.

Digitized by Google

illustrate ***hoc studio facis*** (θέλει, corresponding to Aristotle's στοχαζόμενοι).

To this accusation the poet replies:

> Unde petitum
> hoc in me iacis? est auctor quis denique eorum
> vixi cum quibus?

The charge of willful abuse is of course derived from the fact that he professes to write satire, and hence is assumed to wield the malignant weapons of a Lucilius or a Cratinus. But, he rejoins, you do wrong to condemn me in the general suspicion and hate with which you look on satire (***suspectum genus hoc scribendi***); nor could any one of my friends, who know my mind and my work, have said that I take pleasure in abuse.[1] But Horace allows his critic to go on and paint a still blacker picture of him in the words which follow:

> 'Absentem qui rodit amicum,
> qui non defendit alio culpante, solutos
> qui captat risus hominum famamque dicacis,
> fingere qui non visa potest, commissa tacere
> qui nequit, hic niger est, hunc tu, Romane, caveto.'

This description is an amplification of the preceding ***laedere gaudes***, and corresponds also to the description of the satirist given in vss. 34–38. The βωμολόχος, whose jest has some object beyond his own amusement, is seen in the words ***solutos*** || ***qui captat risus hominum famamque dicacis:*** Verse 85—***fingere qui non visa potest, commissa tacere***—is not meant, of course, in a merely general sense of one who will lie or betray a trust. It serves to delineate more fully the character of the man whose whole thought is bent on provoking laughter, for the sake of which he sacrifices the most fundamental virtues; he is lost to everything but his jest, and is the slave of laughter—ὁ βωμολόχος ἥττων ἐστὶ τοῦ γελοίου (Eth. Nic. IV 14, 1128a35).[2]

[1] The question ***est auctor quis denique eorum*** || ***vixi cum quibus*** does not ask for information: it is a rhetorical form of negation.

[2] Editors are by no means agreed that these words are to be assigned to the ***adversarius*** whom Horace has introduced. But the view has gained ground since it was first advocated by H. Keck in 1856, and, unless I deceive myself, the course of my present argument proves the necessity of taking them out of the mouth of Horace. There is, however, concrete evidence that the poet intended them to be so understood, quite apart from what might be thought subjective considerations. The critic sums up his indictment with the phrase

Digitized by Google

Horace does not answer this sombre indictment directly, but proceeds to give two contrasting examples of freedom of speech, with the judgments which they call forth.

Saepe tribus lectis videas cenare quaternos,
e quibus unus amet quavis adspergere cunctos
praeter eum qui praebet aquam; post hunc quoque potus,
condita cum verax aperit praecordia Liber.
Hic tibi comis et urbanus liberque videtur
infesto nigris. Ego si risi, quod ineptus
pastillos Rufillus olet, Gargonius hircum,
lividus et mordax videor tibi?

The slanderer in society goes unrebuked or is even praised for his loose tongue, while the poet is branded as vicious for a trifling jibe at two notorious asses. The reason for this difference Horace does not need to repeat, for he has already pointed out that the historical associations of satirical writing expose one who professes it to harsh judgment. The offence of Horace lies in the fact that this example, in spite of its harmlessness, is a specimen of *ὀνομαστὶ κωμῳδεῖν*, the dreaded weapon of Lucilius and the old comedy.

Mentio siquae
de Capitolini furtis iniecta Petilli
te coram fuerit, defendas, ut tuus est mos:
'me Capitolinus convictore usus amicoque
a puero est causaque mea permulta rogatus
fecit et incolumis laetor quod vivit in urbe.
Sed tamen admiror, quo pacto iudicium illud
fugerit.' Hic nigrae sucus lolliginis, haec est
aerugo mera; quod vitium procul afore chartis
atque animo prius, ut siquid promittere de me
possum aliud, vere promitto.

As in the preceding Horace had contrasted an example of license of speech in private life with an innocent specimen of his

hic niger est, and it would be easy, but superfluous to any one familiar with the vocabulary of the subject, to illustrate by examples the frequent association of this and similar words (*ater*, *lividus*, etc.) with the idea of satire. *Niger* is therefore a descriptive designation of the character which tradition had assigned to the satirist. Now just below, when Horace replies to his critic, he observes that at any dinner-table one may see a relentless wit, who, however, instead of earning reproach and censure, *tibi comis et urbanus liberque videtur | infesto nigris* (91). The words *tibi* . . . *infesto nigris* thus assign very definitely the preceding description to the critic. The plural number also reveals that it is as one of a class, and not as an individual, that the poet is exposed to the charge of malignity.

Digitized by Google

own personal satire, so here he contrasts the almost unconscious venom of his imaginary critic, the friend of Petillius, with the same illustration from his own work. 'If mention is made of Petillius Capitolinus, your friend and comrade, you betray him under the guise of friendship and good-will. Now, if my harmless allusion to Rufillus and Gargonius seemed to you a dark (*lividus*) and cutting (*mordax*) piece of malice, such treatment of your friend and companion is nothing less than blackness itself (*nigrae sucus lolliginis*) and pure corrosiveness (*aerugo mera*).[1]

Liberius si
dixero quid, si forte iocosius, hoc mihi iuris
cum venia dabis: insuevit pater optimus hoc me
ut fugerem exemplis vitiorum quaeque notando.

The poet's revolt against classification with the traditional masters of satire is nowhere more direct than in these words. For Horace affirms that what little license of speech he may have been guilty of is not due to emulation of the spirit of Lucilius or Aristophanes, but to the homely habit inculcated by his good father. Whether Horace is quite sincere and whether imitation of Lucilius was not in truth the starting-point of his earliest work does not concern our present inquiry.[2] At all events, he now chooses to disavow any indebtedness which he may have owed to the literary tradition of satire. Accordingly, from this point on, he sets forth very briefly what we may call his programme. Like the preceding portion of the satire, it is put concretely, as a picture of his daily life and reflections, the product of his father's training.

Cum me hortaretur, parce frugaliter atque
viverem uti contentus eo quod mi ipse parasset,
'nonne vides, Albi ut male vivat filius utque
Baius inops? magnum documentum, ne patriam rem
perdere quis velit;' a turpi meretricis amore

[1] The observation that *nigrae sucus lolliginis* and *aerugo mera* are, so to speak, the superlative degrees of *lividus* and *mordax*, respectively, affords the connection between this example of the malice of everyday conversation and the specimen of the *ὀνομαστὶ κωμῳδεῖν* from his own satire which Horace had instanced.

[2] Lucian Müller (Lucilius, Lips. 1872, p. 293), not recognizing the purpose of Horace's claim, says: "Etsi nihil laudi Horatii parentis velim detractum, non tamen potest negari Lucilium et ipsum propositis exemplis, quae ex principibus civitatis sive ex plebe pro arbitrio assumeret, vitiorum perversitatem sive foeditatem saepius demonstrasse."

Digitized by Google

cum deterreret, 'Scetani dissimilis sis;'
ne sequerer moechas, concessa cum venere uti
possem, 'deprensi non bella est fama Treboni'
aiebat. 'Sapiens, vitatu quidque petitu
sit melius, causas reddet tibi; mi satis est, si
traditum ab antiquis morem servare tuamque,
dum custodis eges, vitam famamque tueri
incolumem possum, simul ac duraverit aetas
membra animumque tuum, nabis sine cortice.' Sic me
formabat puerum dictis et sive iubebat,
ut facerem quid, 'habes auctorem, quo facias hoc,'
unum ex iudicibus selectis obiciebat,
sive vetabat, 'an hoc inhonestum ac inutile factu
necne sit addubites, flagret rumore malo cum
hic atque ille?' Avidos vicinum funus ut aegros
exanimat mortisque metu se parcere cogit,
sic teneros animos aliena opprobria saepe
absterrent vitiis. Ex hoc ego sanus ab illis
perniciem quaecumque ferunt, mediocribus et quis
ignoscas vitiis teneor; fortassis et istinc
largiter abstulerit longa aetas, liber amicus,
consilium proprium, neque enim, cum lectulus aut me
porticus excepit, desum mihi. 'Rectius hoc est;
hoc faciens vivam melius; sic dulcis amicis
occurram; hoc quidam non belle: numquid ego illi
imprudens olim faciam simile?' haec ego mecum
compressis agito labris; ubi quid datur oti,
inludo chartis. Hoc est mediocribus illis
ex vitiis unum; cui si concedere nolis,
multa poetarum veniet manus, auxilio quae
sit mihi—nam multo plures sumus—ac veluti te
Iudaei cogemus in hanc concedere turbam.

His writing, he implies, is merely the outgrowth of this habit, taught him by his father, of striving to correct his own faults by observing the foibles and vices of others. In this effort he is constantly employed, and with reflections on the conduct of others and their lessons for himself he busies himself at home and abroad. In the whole of this description there is a designed contrast to the rôle which tradition and literary criticism had attributed to the satirist. Against the personal criticism, the aggressiveness, the fondness for publicity,[1] and the malignant spirit which satire was supposed to display, he arrays his own ideal. He would not be a prosecutor of wrong even though there were rascals to bring to justice (70); the purpose of his

[1] In addition to vss. 37, 72 and 83, see also (for Lucilius) on I 10, 73.

Digitized by Google

writing, as of his living, is, not to correct the faults of others, but his own (106 ff.); he does not seek to hurt (78), nor to raise a coarse laugh at the expense of others (35 and 83), but to amuse and to entertain himself.[1] He asks not for a miscellaneous audience of the street-corners (38), the baths (75), or the book-shops (71), but is content with the ear of his friends (73 and I 10, 74 ff.).

It is a commonplace of criticism to say that the satire of Horace was of necessity excluded from many fields which Lucilius cultivated with vigor and success. This is usually attributed in no small degree to the restraints upon freedom of speech which the security of the new régime made necessary. But had all barriers to open criticism in public and private life been removed, we may, I believe, confidently assume that Horace would not have given expression to his satirical vein in a manner very different from that which he has employed. "The law-makers," says Aristotle, "prohibit certain forms of abusive language. They would perhaps have done well to prohibit some kinds of satirical jest (*σκώπτειν*) also. The gentleman, therefore, and the man of true refinement will be, so to speak, a law unto himself" (Eth. Nic. IV 14). Thus neither the difference between the social rank and the political influence of Lucilius and Horace, nor the additional restraints upon the expression of opinion in the time of Augustus conditioned the character of the Horatian satire. The poet had become a law unto himself. Thus, after a few tentative efforts in a more or less distinctly Lucilian manner, as it would seem, Horace early came into his own humane and kindly point of view. He found that if he would be understood and judged aright by his public, he must come to an open understanding with them concerning his relation to the history and character of the literary form which he professed. Accordingly in this work, early in his literary career, he seeks to make his position understood. He first shows that the preconception of the nature of satire which was generally entertained, and which was derived from one phase of the old comedy and from the practice of Lucilius, was narrow and entirely antipathetic to his nature. In the matter of form he disclaims all title to the name of poet, and therefore with open disavowal calls his satires conversations (*sermones*).[2] His own

[1] Cf. I 6, 122: lecto aut scripto quod me tacitum iuvat. See also I 10, 7–15.

[2] Cf. the writer's article, 'Are the Letters of Horace Satires?,' in vol. XVIII (1897), No. 2, of this Journal.

Digitized by Google

writing, he affirms, does not follow any famous models of free speech and licentious wit, but the homely practice of observation of life taught him by his father, and has for its aim his own improvement and amusement.

Excursus on Persius and the Theory of Satire.

In the preceding interpretation the question may fairly be raised whether Horace had reflected deliberately on the nature of the jest suitable for the satirist to employ, and whether he has in mind the discussions of that subject which were to be found, presumably, in ethical and rhetorical treatises subsequent to Aristotle's treatment of the matter. In this excursus I would point out that the answer to this question may be facilitated by the consideration of two passages of Persius, which, on the one hand, are undoubtedly influenced by Horace, and, on the other, reveal distinct influence of philosophical theory in regard to the subject.

The first of these is from the fifth satire, vss. 17–20, which gives with rather surprising accuracy the essential content of the poem of Horace which we have been considering. For we saw that Horace makes twofold protest: (1) against the conception of satire as an elevated branch of poetry derived from the lofty manner of the old comedy, and (2) against the view that the satirist was privileged to employ a scurrilous and unbecoming license of jest and invective. The Horatian ideal of form Persius reproduces thus:

> verba togae sequeris iunctura callidus acri
> ore teres modico—

Horace's attitude toward the content and spirit of satire is expressed in the words which follow:

> pallentis radere mores
> doctus et ingenuo culpam defigere ludo.

If the phrase *verba togae* contains any allusion to the *fabula togata* (Conington, Gildersleeve), which I doubt, it is only for the purpose of associating the language of satire with that of comedy, as Horace does—*sermoni propiora, sermo merus.* On *ore modico* a word presently. But this does not advance us beyond Horace. In the expression *ingenuo culpam defigere ludo*, however, Persius interprets for us Horace's attitude of hostility toward the harsh

Digitized by Google

and scurrilous wit of Lucilius by a technical term, or the reflection of a technical term, which reveals that Persius, at all events, has in mind the theoretical standpoint which I have suggested may lie behind the words of Horace. Conington compares the *πεπαιδευμένη ὕβρις* of Aristotle (Rhet. II 12, 10). But the real Aristotelian parallel is found in Eth. IV 14 (1128a20): *καὶ ἡ τοῦ ἐλευθερίου παιδιὰ* (*ingenuus ludus*) *διαφέρει τῆς τοῦ ἀνδραποδώδους κτλ.* The man who observes consistently the proper limits in this respect is the *ἐπιδέξιος*, and *ἐπιδεξιότης* is a quality of the mean or ideal: *τῇ μέσῃ δ' ἕξει οἰκεῖον καὶ ἡ ἐπιδεξιότης ἐστίν* (ib.). The *ingenuus ludus*, the jest of a gentleman, is then the Aristotelian mean of *εὐτραπελία*, removed from boorishness (*ἀγροικία*), which is the *ἔλλειψις*, and from scurrility (*βωμολοχία*), which is the *ὑπερβολή*. I call attention to this because it adds some light to the tortuous expression *ore teres modico*, which seems not to have been fully understood. We saw that Horace, in contrasting the nature of true poetry with his own prosaic *sermones*, described the former as *os magna sonaturum*. To emphasize the contrast Horace goes far when he implies by comparison that satire is *sermo merus*—farther than Persius is willing to follow him. For he puts over against *os magna sonaturum* not the extreme antithesis which Horace named *sermo merus*, but *ore teres modico*. That is, as the content of satire should reveal a spirit of *ingenuus ludus* which we have found to be the Aristotelian mean, so in language it should occupy the mean between elevated poetical style and prose, viz. *ore teres modico*.[1]

But, although the full meaning of Persius only appears by comparison with Aristotle, it would be wrong to conclude that Persius is directly indebted to him. This appears from the radical difference between them in their attitude toward the old comedy. To Aristotle, as is well known, the old comedy afforded the most conspicuous illustrations of illiberal jest. For, after pointing out that there is a difference between the servile and the liberal, the uncultivated and the cultivated forms of wit, he continues (l. c.): *ἴδοι ἄν τις καὶ ἐκ τῶν κωμῳδιῶν τῶν παλαιῶν καὶ τῶν καινῶν· τοῖς μὲν γὰρ ἦν γελοῖον ἡ αἰσχρολογία, τοῖς δὲ μᾶλλον ἡ ὑπόνοια.* It is

[1] The extremes in relation to which these words are the mean, are given by Horace in A. P., vss. 94 and 95:

> Iratusque Chremes tumido delitigat ore,
> Et tragicus plerumque dolet sermone pedestri
> etc.

Digitized by Google

therefore a matter of some surprise that Persius, in another passage which touches on the legitimate and becoming forms of jest, makes the three masters of old comedy ideal representatives of the true satirical spirit. It is the well-known place in the first satire in which he tells for whom he writes.

Audaci quicumque adflate Cratino
Iratum Eupolidem praegrandi cum sene palles
Aspice et haec, si forte aliquid decoctius audis.
Inde vaporata lector mihi ferveat aure:
Non hic qui in crepidas Graiorum ludere gestit.
Sordidus, et lusco qui possit dicere 'lusce,'
Sese aliquem credens, Italo quod honore supinus
Fregerit eminas Arreti aedilis iniquas;
Nec qui abaco numeros et secto in pulvere metas
Scit risisse vafer, multum gaudere paratus,
Si cynico barbam petulans nonaria vellat.

Those who come with taste purified by the study of these famous masters of Attic wit shall be his audience, not the sordid philistine who expects low jibes at the slippered Greeks, nor the man whose own sense of wit does not rise above the personal abuse which finds an object of laughter in some physical defect or deformity[1]; nor, again, those who find in ridicule of philosophy and personal indignities offered to its votaries fit subject for merriment. The doctrine of this passage is Aristotelian, as the editors point out, quoting Eth. Nic. III 7 (1114a24): *τοῖς μὲν διὰ φύσιν αἰσχροῖς οὐδεὶς ἁπτιμᾷ*. It should be noted also that the example is Aristotelian: *οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἂν ὀνειδίσειε τυφλῷ φύσει* κτλ. (ib.).

We see thus that, although Persius here and in 5, 17 ff. follows the Aristotelian teaching in regard to the becoming form of jest, he does not share Aristotle's feeling toward the old comedy. On the contrary, it represents to him the purest type of legitimate satire (*inde vaporata aure*). But it is not impossible to parallel, and so in a measure to explain, the apparent anomaly that he instances as his ideal of satire exactly that literature to which Aristotle had referred to illustrate the violation of the very principles which Persius advocates. I have already called atten-

[1] Vss. 129 and 130 seem to be a rather meaningless digression, and owe their origin, apparently, to the effervescent facility of Persius in Horatian reminiscence. For the words *lusco possit dicere lusce* carried him back to the swaggering praetor of Fundi, Aufidius Luscus (Serm. I 5, 34). I doubt if they have any bearing on the point that Persius is urging, unless, possibly, it be to characterize such personal jest as provincial, still bearing the *vestigia ruris*.

Digitized by Google

tion to the fact that Aristotle's condemnation of old comedy did not prevail generally among later theorists and critics. It was a product so vital and vigorous as to survive the sentence even of the Stagyrite. Plutarch, to be sure, is animated with the same spirit of hostility in his Comparison of Aristophanes and Menander (cf. also *Συμποσιακά*, VII 8); but for the most part subsequent literary criticism attributed to the old comedy not only an aggressive scurrility, but also a pleasing and liberal spirit of jest. Evidence on this point might be accumulated from the treatises *περὶ κωμῳδίας* and other sources, but a single quotation from Platonius *π. κωμ.* II (Dübner), characterizing Aristophanes, will suffice: *ἔχει πρὸς τοὺς ἁμαρτάνοντας τὸ σφοδρὸν τοῦ Κρατίνου καὶ τὸ τῆς ἐπιτρεχούσης χάριτος Εὐπόλιδος.* From such criticism was developed the general formulation of comic theory: *ἴδιον δὲ κωμῳδίας τὸ μεμιγμένον ἔχειν τοῖς σκώμμασι* (= *τὸ σφοδρὸν*) *γέλωτα* (= *ἡ χάρις*).[1] But the most striking illustration of this estimate of the old comedy, so different from Aristotle's, is found in a passage of Cicero, which affords a close parallel to Persius. In De officiis, I 104, Cicero says: *duplex omnino est iocandi genus: unum inliberale petulans flagitiosum obscenum, alterum elegans urbanum ingeniosum facetum. quo genere non modo Plautus noster et Atticorum antiqua comoedia, sed etiam philosophorum Socraticorum libri referti sunt.* This certainly is remarkable, in view of the fact that Aristotle, whose language in characterization of the two kinds of jest, is here reproduced, had said of the writers of old comedy: *τοῖς μὲν ἦν γελοῖον ἡ αἰσχρολογία.* One is compelled to wonder, as in the case of Persius, whether Cicero speaks from his own knowledge of the old comedy, or whether he is not reproducing the judgment of some one else. For it is true that almost any comedy of Aristophanes would have afforded Cicero specimens of wit in plenty which he must have condemned by his own standards, in which (l. c.) *rerum turpitudini adhibetur verborum obscenitas* (*αἰσχρολογία*). Another passage illustrative of the same point of view, from Horace, Serm. I 10, 16, will be taken up in its place.

In conclusion it should be noticed that Persius does not group Lucilius with the masters of old comedy as a representative of the ideal spirit of satire. His only characterization of him describes the vehemence of his invective and attack (I 114):

[1] For other illustrations see A. J. P., vol. XV, p. 13, note 2.

Digitized by Google

secuit Lucilius urbem
Te Lupe, te Muci, et genuinum fregit in illis.

It would not do, however, to say that these words imply criticism of Lucilius, for a skillful use of the aggressive and vehement in satire was in itself ground for praise, as Horace says: *at idem quod sale multo || urbem defricuit, charta laudatur eadem.* But no one can doubt that the characterization of Horace which follows:

Omne vafer vitium ridenti Flaccus amico
Tangit et admissus circum praecordia ludit
etc.

is drawn with more sympathetic feeling. Together the descriptions of Lucilius and Horace make up the ideal of satire; and just as Aristophanes, in the passage of Platonius quoted above, was said to combine the vehemence of Cratinus and the charm of Eupolis, so Lucilius is the type of τὸ σφοδρόν and Horace of ἡ χάρις.

G. L. HENDRICKSON.

Digitized by Google

II.—TENNYSON AND HOMER.

The most casual reader of Tennyson's poems must often be struck by the frequency of his allusions to classical literature and mythology, and by the frequency of his use of what is essentially classical language or idiom. The influence of Homer or Theocritus, of Virgil or Horace, may be traced upon many of his pages, and he that has eyes to see may often light upon interesting parallels even in quite remote corners of the classical field. Perhaps no English poet since Milton has kept so close to the diction of the great Greek and Roman models.

In the 'Specimen of a Translation of the Iliad in Blank Verse' and in his 'Achilles over the Trench,' Tennyson has given us two of his favorite Homeric passages: Il. VIII 542–61, XVIII 202–31. The Memoir (II 15) records his own spirited prose translation of another passage of the Iliad which he admired for its "beauty of poetic diction and feeling," the Parting of Paris, at the end of the sixth book. The single hexameters that he was fondest of quoting for their "strong-wing'd music" were Il. VII 422, or Od. XIX 434:

ἐξ ἀκαλαρρείταο βαθυρρόου Ὠκεανοῖο,

and Il. I 34:

βῆ δ' ἀκέων παρὰ θῖνα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης.

And he once remarked upon the fine effect of the monotonous ending of words in -ων at the beginning of Il. XIII (Memoir, II 215).

Among the "choice paintings of wise men" which adorned the royal dais of 'The Palace of Art' were those of Milton, and Shakespeare, and Dante,

> "And there the Ionian father of the rest;
> A million wrinkles carved his chin;
> A hundred winters snow'd upon his breast,
> From cheek and throat and chin."

In the lines 'On Translations of Homer' we have the familiar protest against all attempts to give the Iliad in English hexameters:

Digitized by Google

"These lame hexameters the strong-wing'd music of Homer
No—but a most burlesque barbarous experiment."

In that wonderful university lecture which is reported in the second part of 'The Princess' we are reminded that

"The highest is the measure of the man,
And not the Kaffir, Hottentot, Malay,
Nor those horn-handed breakers of the glebe,
But Homer, Plato, Verulam."

And in the poem 'Parnassus' we are told that the fire within a true poet would never falter:

"Let the golden Iliad vanish, Homer here is Homer there."

In some of his poems which deal with distinctly classical subjects, Tennyson's language is almost of necessity indebted to Homer. In the opening lines of the poem 'Oenone,'

"Behind the valley topmost Gargarus
Stands up and takes the morning,"

we have a reminiscence of the Γάργαρον ἄκρον of Il. XIV 292, XV 152. The "many-fountain'd Ida" of the same poem is a stock Homeric phrase, Ἴδη πολυπίδαξ; e. g. Il. XIV 157, 283, 307. "Light-foot Iris," too, is Homeric, πόδας ὠκέα Ἶρις; cp. Il. XVIII 202:

"So saying, light-foot Iris pass'd away,"

as it runs in Tennyson's own translation. The "rosy slender fingers" of the Idalian Aphrodite are like those of the ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἠώς. And the "whirling Simois" may remind one of the "eddying," or "silver-eddying," or "deep-eddying" Xanthus, Il. XXI 2, 8, 15. The poem 'Ulysses' has, to be sure, "an echo of Dante in it" (Memoir, II 70), but some of the language is Homeric. In the splendid lines

"And drunk delight of battle with my peers
Far on the ringing plains of windy Troy,"

we may perhaps recognize the striking word χάρμη ("the stern joy which warriors feel"), which occurs, for example, four times in Il. XVII. In "windy Troy" we find another Homeric epithet, Ἴλιος ἠνεμόεσσα; cp. Il. XII 115, XVIII 174, etc. And at the close of the poem,

"Push off, and sitting well in order smite
The sounding furrows,"

Digitized by Google

we have one of the recurrent lines of the Odyssey that gladden the schoolboy's heart:

ἐξῆς δ' ἐζόμενοι πολιὴν ἅλα τύπτον ἐρετμοῖς.

Tennyson's poem 'The Lotos-Eaters' is developed from Homer's brief story, Od. IX 94:

τῶν δ' ὅς τις λωτοῖο φάγοι μελιηδέα καρπὸν,
οὐκέτ' ἀπαγγεῖλαι πάλιν ἤθελεν οὐδὲ νέεσθαι,
ἀλλ' αὐτοῦ βούλοντο μετ' ἀνδράσι Λωτοφάγοισι
λωτὸν ἐρεπτόμενοι μενέμεν νόστου τε λαθέσθαι.

And when the singers of the 'Choric Song,' who are, of course, part of the company of Odysseus, are heaping up reasons against their returning home:

"Or else the island princes over-bold
Have eat our substance, and the minstrel sings
Before them of the ten years' war in Troy,
And our great deeds, as half-forgotten things,"

their fancy is obviously due to Od. I 325:

Τοῖσι δ' ἀοιδὸς ἄειδε περικλυτός, οἱ δὲ σιωπῇ
εἵατ' ἀκούοντες· ὁ δ' Ἀχαιῶν νόστον ἄειδε
λυγρὸν, ὃν ἐκ Τροίης ἐπετείλατο Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη.

The poem 'Demeter and Persephone' is based upon the story of Demeter in the fourth Homeric Hymn, with one or two details drawn from Ovid. The closing lines:

"and the shadowy warrior glide
Along the silent field of Asphodel,"

may be compared with Od. XI 538:

ψυχὴ δὲ ποδώκεος Αἰακίδαο
φοίτα μακρὰ βιβᾶσα κατ' ἀσφοδελὸν λειμῶνα.

The simile in 'The Death of Oenone':

"She heard a wailing cry, that seem'd at first
Thin as the bat-like shrillings of the Dead
When driven to Hades,"

is borrowed from the beginning of Od. XXIV:

ὡς δ' ὅτε νυκτερίδες μυχῷ ἄντρου θεσπεσίοιο
τρίζουσαι ποτέονται, ...

Digitized by Google

ὡς αἱ τετριγυῖαι ἅμ' ἕποντο· ἦρχε δ' ἄρα σφιν
Ἑρμείας δεκάεργα κατ' εὐρώεντα κέλευθα.

And a similar comparison is employed in 'The Voyage of Maeldune':

"Our voices were thinner and fainter than
any flittermouse-shriek."

The passage in 'Tithonus':

"I wither slowly in thine arms,
Here at the quiet limit of the world,"

is due to the story of Tithonus in the Hymn to Aphrodite, 227:

ναίε παρ' Ὠκεανοῖο ῥοῇς ἐπὶ πείρασι γαίης.

And in the poem 'Lucretius':

"since he never sware,
Except his wrath were wreak'd on wretched man,
That he would only shine among the dead
Hereafter; tales! for never yet on earth
Could dead flesh creep, or bits of roasting ox
Moan round the spit,"

we have an allusion to Od. XII 382 ff., the anger of Helios Hyperion at the slaughter of his cattle:

'εἰ δέ μοι οὐ τίσουσι βοῶν ἐπιείκελ' ἀμοιβήν,
δύσομαι εἰς Ἀίδαο καὶ ἐν νεκύεσσι φαείνω.'
. . . τοῖσιν δ' αὐτίκ' ἔπειτα θεοὶ τέραα προβφαινον·
εἶρπον μὲν ῥινοί, κρέα δ' ἀμφ' ὀβελοῖσι μεμύκει,
ὀπταλέα τε καὶ ὠμά· βοῶν δ' ὡς γίγνετο φωνή.

There are a few other Homeric allusions in Tennyson that may be mentioned here. After the beautiful love-song in the fourth part of 'The Princess,'

"O Swallow, Swallow, flying, flying south," etc.,

the narrative continues:

"I ceased, and all the ladies, each at each,
Like the Ithacensian suitors in old time,
Stared with great eyes, and laugh'd with alien lips,
And knew not what they meant."

The allusion is to the wooers of Penelope, Od. XX 347:

Ὣς φάτο Τηλέμαχος· μνηστῆρσι δὲ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη
ἄσβεστον γέλῳ ὦρσε, παρέπλαγξεν δὲ νόημα.
οἱ δ' ἤδη γναθμοῖσι γελοίων ἀλλοτρίοισιν, κ. τ. λ.

Digitized by Google

Horace has adapted the same Homeric expression, Sat. II 3, 72 malis ridentem alienis. There are two passages in 'The Princess' which allude to the adventures of Odysseus with the Sirens. When, in Part II, the three male intruders into the women's university are detected by the Lady Psyche, and are informed that the penalty of their intrusion is death, Florian jestingly asks

> "who could think
> The softer Adams of your Academe,
> O sister, Sirens tho' they be, were such
> As chanted on the bleaching bones of men?"

in allusion to Od. XII 44:

> ἀλλὰ τε Σειρῆνες λιγυρῇ θέλγουσιν ἀοιδῇ,
> ἥμεναι ἐν λειμῶνι· πολὺς δ' ἀμφ' ὀστεόφιν θὶς
> ἀνδρῶν πυθομένων, περὶ δὲ ῥινοὶ μινύθουσι.

And at the close of the song in Part IV, the song of the "tears, idle tears," that rise in the heart and gather to the eyes in thinking of the days that are no more, the Princess herself answers, with some disdain:

> "If indeed there haunt
> About the moulder'd lodges of the Past
> So sweet a voice and vague, fatal to men,
> Well needs it we should cram our ears with wool
> And so pace by,"

a remark which is obviously suggested by the story of Odysseus anointing the ears of his men with wax, and thus getting them safely past the Sirens and their sweet song. The line in 'Becket,' Act I, Sc. 2:

> "Our woodland Circe that hath witch'd the King,"

refers to the fate of the comrades of Eurylochus, Od. X 237, and the reference in 'The Princess,' VII 147:

> "lovelier in her mood
> Than in her mould that other, when she came
> From barren deeps to conquer all with love . . .
> To meet her Graces, where they deck'd her out
> For worship without end,"

takes us back to the story of Aphrodite in the fifth Homeric Hymn.

In the prologue to the 'Morte d'Arthur,' that poem is playfully described as one of the twelve books of a great epic of King Arthur—twelve books that were "faint Homeric echoes, nothing-

Digitized by Google

worth." That is to say, it is consciously and purposely Homeric. The stately opening lines:

> "So all day long the noise of battle roll'd
> Among the mountains by the winter sea,"

may be compared with such passages as Il. XVIII 209:

> "All day the men contend in grievous war
> From their own city,"

as Tennyson translates it in his 'Achilles over the Trench,' or Il. XVII 384:

> Τοῖς δὲ πανημερίοις ἔριδος μέγα νεῖκος ὀρώρει
> ἀργαλέης.

The adverb 'lightly,' which occurs five times in the poem:

> "Watch what thou seest, and lightly bring me word,"

"and lightly went that other to the King," etc., seems to represent the Homeric ῥίμφα of Il. VI 511, X 54, etc. The words of Sir Bedivere:

> "Not tho' I live three lives of mortal men,"

remind one of the aged Nestor, Il. I 250:

> τῷ δ' ἤδη δύο μὲν γενεαὶ μερόπων ἀνθρώπων
> ἐφθίαθ', οἵ οἱ πρόσθεν ἅμα τράφεν ἠδ' ἐγένοντο
> ἐν Πύλῳ ἠγαθέῃ, μετὰ δὲ τριτάτοισιν ἄνασσεν.

The passage in the bold knight's soliloquy:

> "So might some old man speak in the aftertime
> To all the people, winning reverence,"

may be compared with such passages as Il. VI 459:

> καί ποτέ τις εἴπῃσιν ἰδὼν κατὰ δάκρυ χέουσαν·
> "Ἕκτορος ἥδε γυνή,'

or Il. VI 479:

> καί ποτέ τις εἴποι 'πατρός γ' ὅδε πολλὸν ἀμείνων'
> ἐκ πολέμου ἀνιόντα.

And the phrase "winning reverence" may recall the statement of Od. VIII 479:

> πᾶσι γὰρ ἀνθρώποισιν ἐπιχθονίοισιν ἀοιδοὶ
> τιμῆς ἔμμοροί εἰσι καὶ αἰδοῦς.

Digitized by Google

The words which describe Sir Bedivere flinging the brand Excalibur into the middle mere:

"And strongly wheel'd and threw it,"

and, a little below, "and flung him, wheeling him," may be likened to the ῥῖψ' ἐπιδινήσας of Il. III 378, or the ἧκ' ἐπιδινήσας of Od. IX 538. A close verbal parallel is found in Virgil, Aen. V 642 conixa coruscat et iacit. The line

"Dry clash'd his harness in the icy caves,"

recalls the Homeric use of αὖον to describe a sound, Il. XII 160:

κόρυθες δ' ἀμφ' αὖον ἀΰτευν
βαλλόμεναι μυλάκεσσι καὶ ἀσπίδες ὁμφαλόεσσαι,

or Il. XIII 441:

δὴ τότε γ' αὖον ἄϋσεν ἐρεικόμενος περὶ δουρί.

And with this we may compare also

"the dry harsh roar of the great horn,"

in 'The Last Tournament'; the line in 'Geraint and Enid':

"And all in passiòn uttering a dry shriek";

and the line in 'The Voyage':

"Dry sang the tackle, sang the sail."

The description of the island valley of Avilion:

"Where falls not hail, or rain, or any snow,
Nor ever wind blows loudly,"

is like the picture of Olympus, Od. VI 43:

οὔτ' ἀνέμοισι τινάσσεται οὔτε ποτ' ὄμβρῳ
δεύεται οὔτε χιὼν ἐπιπίλναται,

or the picture of the Elysian plain, Od. IV 566:

οὐ νιφετὸς, οὔτ' ἄρ χειμὼν πολὺς οὔτε ποτ' ὄμβρος.

The place, moreover, is "deep-meadow'd," like the Ἀνθεια βαθύλειμος of Il. IX 151, and its

"bowery hollows crown'd with summer sea"

remind one of the island of Circe, Od. X 195:

νῆσον, τὴν πέρι πόντος ἀπείριτος ἐστεφάνωται.

Digitized by Google

But the "faint Homeric echoes" of Tennyson are not confined to the 'Morte d'Arthur,' or to the poems on classical subjects. The picture in 'The Last Tournament' of the churl

> "sputtering thro' the *hedge of* splinter'd *teeth*,"

contains the ἕρκος ὀδόντων of Il. IV 350, IX 409, etc. The lines in 'Love Thou Thy Land':

> "To follow flying steps of Truth
> Across the brazen *bridge of war*,"

repeat another familiar Homeric phrase; cp. Il. VIII 553:

> Οἱ δὲ μέγα φρονέοντες ἐπὶ πτολέμοιο γεφύρας
> ἧατο πανύχιοι,

or, in Tennyson's own version:

> "And these all night upon the bridge of war
> Sat glorying."

And with the phrase here translated by 'glorying,' or with the κυδιόων of Il. II 579, VI 509, we may compare the passage in 'Gareth and Lynette':

> "And Gareth silent gazed upon the knight,
> Who stood a moment ere his horse was brought,
> *Glorying*."

The curious expression in 'The Princess,' I 64:

> "then he chew'd
> The thrice-turn'd cud of wrath, and *cook'd his spleen*,"

is adapted from the χόλον πέσσειν, or καταπέσσειν, of Il. I 81, IV 513. The line in 'The Princess,' IV 483:

> "And clad in iron *burst the ranks of war*,"

may be compared with such lines of the Iliad as XI 90:

> τῆμος σφῇ ἀρετῇ Δαναοὶ ῥήξαντο φάλαγγας,

VI 6, XI 538, or with Virgil, Aen. XII 683 media agmina rumpit. The figure in 'The Princess,' V 134:

> "The lifting of whose eyelash is my lord,"

is developed from Il. I 528:

> Ἦ καὶ κυανέῃσιν ἐπ' ὀφρύσι νεῦσε Κρονίων,

perhaps through Horace, Od. III 1, 8 cuncta supercilio moventis. The epithet in 'The Princess,' V 90:

Digitized by Google

"*Ill mother* that I was to leave her there,"

is Homeric: Od. XXIII 97:

μῆτερ ἐμή, δύσμητερ, ἀπηνέα θυμὸν ἔχουσα.

The picture in 'The Coming of Arthur':

"And Gawain went, and bursting into song
Sprang out, and *follow'd by his flying hair*
Ran like a colt, and leapt at what he saw,"

seems to owe something to the Parting of Paris, Il. VI 506 ff.: "And as when a stall-kept horse . . . dasheth through the plain . . . *and his mane flieth back on either shoulder* . . .; so ran the son of Priam, Paris, from the height of Pergamus, all in arms, glittering like the sun, laughing for light-heartedness, and his swift feet bare him." This is Tennyson's own translation of one of his favorite passages (Memoir, II 15). The simile in the fifth part of 'The Princess':

"And as the fiery Sirius alters hue,
And bickers into red and emerald, shone
Their morions, wash'd with morning, as they came,"

must have been consciously borrowed from Il. V 5:

ἀστέρ' ὀπωρινῷ ἐναλίγκιον, ὅς τε μάλιστα
λαμπρὸν παμφαίνῃσι λελουμένος Ὠκεανοῖο.

The repeated line in 'Dora':

"And the sun fell, and all the land was dark,"

sounds like an echo of the line that comes in like a refrain in the Odyssey—twice in Bk. III, three times in Bk. XV—

δύσετό τ' ἠέλιος σκιόωντό τε πᾶσαι ἀγυιαί.

And the same Homeric description of nightfall is employed in 'The Talking Oak,' of the famous tree

"Wherein the younger Charles abode
Till *all the paths were dim*."

There are a few other passages which may be mentioned, not as evidence of any direct or indirect indebtedness, but only as interesting parallels. Some of them are, of course, mere commonplaces of poetical rhetoric or imagery. The fancy in 'In Memoriam,' LXVIII:

"Sleep, Death's twin-brother,"

Digitized by Google

is as old as Il. XVI 672, 682:

Ὕπνῳ καὶ Θανάτῳ διδυμάοσιν,

as the similar fancy in 'In Memoriam,' LXXI:

"Sleep, kinsman thou to death and trance,"

may be compared with Virgil's phrase, Aen. VI 278:

consanguineus Leti Sopor.

The twilight scene in 'In Memoriam,' CXXI:

"The team is loosen'd from the wain," etc.,

reminds one of the βουλυτόνδε of Od. IX 58; Il. XVI 779. Compare also Horace, Od. III 6, 42; Milton, 'Comus,' 291. The unmeasured mirth aroused by the appearance of the bedraggled hero, in 'The Princess,' V 21:

"And slain with laughter roll'd the gilded squire,"

may be compared with the delight of the heartless suitors at the cruel overthrow of the boxer Irus, Od. XVIII 100:

χεῖρας ἀνασχόμενοι γέλῳ ἔκθανον.

The figure in 'In Memoriam,' CVIII:

"I will not shut me from my kind,
And, lest I stiffen into stone,
I will not eat my heart alone,"

has an ancient counterpart in the story of Bellerophon, Il. VI 202:

ἦ τοι ὁ κὰπ πεδίον τὸ Ἀλήϊον οἶος ἀλᾶτο,
ὃν θυμὸν κατέδων, πάτον ἀνθρώπων ἀλεείνων,

cp. also Od. X 143, 379; Il. XXIV 129. In 'The Princess,' II 94, we have the Lady Psyche's babe:

"In shining draperies, headed like a star,
Her maiden babe, a double April old,"

to remind us of Il. VI 401:

παῖδ' ἐπὶ κόλπῳ ἔχουσ' ἀταλάφρονα, νήπιον αὖτως,
Ἑκτορίδην ἀγαπητὸν, ἀλίγκιον ἀστέρι καλῷ.

And in the sixth part of the same poem Tennyson gives us another simile of the same sort, in speaking of the same child:

"the babe that by us,
Half-lapt in glowing gauze and golden brede,
Lay like a new-fallen meteor on the grass."

Digitized by Google

The description of the Argive Helen, in 'A Dream of Fair Women':

> "A daughter of the gods, divinely tall,
> And most divinely fair,"

recalls the description of the goddess Artemis, in the first Homeric Hymn, 198:

μάλα μεγάλη τε ἰδεῖν καὶ εἶδος ἀγητή.

And the "long-sounding corridors" of 'The Palace of Art,' or the "sounding hall" of 'The Holy Grail,' may be likened to the *αἴθουσα ἐρίδουπος* of the Homeric dwelling: Od. XV 146, 191; III 399.

The lovely lines in 'The Lady of Shalott':

> "Little breezes dusk and shiver
> Thro' the wave that runs for ever,"

have been called an imitation of Virgil's "inhorruit unda tenebris," Aen. III 195, V 11. They have also served to illustrate Horace, Od. I 5, 6 aspera nigris aequora ventis. One who knows Tennyson's pictures of lake, and stream, and sea, may well hesitate to believe that this passage is an imitation at all; but if any ancient parallel be needed, or desired, we may as well go back to "the Ionian father of the rest," and compare the *μέλαινα φρίξ* of Il. XXI 126; Od. IV 402, or the simile in Il. VII 63:

οἵη δὲ Ζεφύροιο ἐχεύατο πόντον ἐπὶ φρὶξ
ὀρνυμένοιο νέον, μελάνει δέ τε πόντος ὑπ' αὐτῆς.

HAVERFORD COLLEGE, *March* 31, 1900. WILFRED P. MUSTARD.

Digitized by Google

III.—PROHIBITIVES IN SILVER LATIN.

Professor Bennett's review of Elmer's theory of the force of tenses in the prohibitive (Cornell Studies, IX 48–65), led me to investigate the usage in the writers of the Silver Age. The results of the first investigation, which was confined to Persius, Lucan, Valerius Flaccus, Silius Italicus, Statius, Martial and Juvenal, were such that other authors were examined. The present paper includes all examples noted in Phaedrus, Seneca (tragedies), Curtius Rufus, the Declamations of the Pseudo-Quintilian, Tacitus, Pliny's Letters, Apuleius (Metamorphoses), Ausonius, and the authors contained in vols. I, III, IV and V of Bährens' Poetae Latini Minores, as well as those already cited. It is my purpose to continue the investigation until the entire period has been examined. A sufficiently large amount, however, has been considered, to warrant the statement of the results reached. Had the investigation revealed nothing more than what had been already the subject of discussion, there would have been no justification for publication. The actual usage of the period, which no theory can invalidate, is such, it seems, as to merit attention.

"The investigation of this question (from the theoretical side) is," as Bennett observes, "a somewhat delicate one." If this be true of Plautus, it is far more delicate in the case of the authors under consideration. The almost entire absence of the dramatic element, the brevity of many selections, the variety of style,—these are some of the factors that add to the difficulty of the task. In this part of my investigation, Professor Elmer has placed me under great obligation by restating his theory and methods in an extended correspondence as well as by placing his unpublished reply to Bennett at my disposal.[1]

My collections are intended to be complete on the use of *ne* with the present and perfect subjunctive, *cave* and *vide* (*ne*) with the same tenses, *ne* with the imperative, *noli* with the infinitive, and some unusual types. All collectors of syntactical material

[1] An abridgment of this has since appeared in A. J. P. XXI 80–91.

Digitized by Google

are aware of the difficulty of making such collections complete. It is to be hoped that the omissions, if any, are few. All clauses that could be regarded as subordinate have been omitted.

After Bennett's treatment of the subjunctive of obligation or propriety (Cornell Studies, IX 1–30), I have not deemed it necessary to go into any formal discussion of the subject. All examples of the subjunctive with *nec*, *nihil* and the like (with a few rare exceptions) have been treated as prohibitives, though placed under proper subheads for convenience of reference.

Let us get Professor Elmer's statement of his theory clearly before us before passing to a consideration of the three divisions under which the subject properly falls—the perfect subjunctive, the present subjunctive, and the imperative.

"The emotion, or earnestness," says he in his reply to Bennett, "which I claim lies in the prohibition comes from alarm, indignation, or the like, caused by a fear (real or pretended) that the act prohibited will take place. If this act itself is of such a character that no particular harm would be likely to result from its performance, I should not expect the perfect to be used (however much excited the speaker might be from other causes), except in those rare instances where energetic utterance is purposely affected."

"Wherever the failure to heed a prohibition even of a purely mental act would be fraught with serious consequences either to the speaker or to some other person in whom the speaker takes a deep interest, my theory would lead one to expect the perfect tense."

"The meaning of the verb, the speaker's attitude toward a particular act concerned in each case and the effect of the performance of it upon his interests . . . these points are the only essential points in my whole theory, they constitute in fact all there is in the theory."

"A fair test of my theory [from a letter of June 5, 1899] may be made in the following manner: Ask in connection with each prohibition the question, 'Will a failure to comply with the prohibition result in a disaster of some sort to one's interests or feelings?' You will find that in prohibitions with the present tense the answer will be 'No!' almost without exception. In prohibitions with the perfect, the answer will in most cases be 'Yes!' and the few exceptions may easily be accounted for."

Digitized by Google

I. *The Perfect Subjunctive.*

Employing these tests, the following perfects are in accord with Elmer's theory:

1. With *ne*.—Phaedr. App. 11, 4 Ne istud dixeris; Multo fuere vires maiores meae (Successful athlete to Aesop, questioning his strength); Curt. Ruf. 4, 10, 32 Sed ne expectaveris per deos, si quid tibi tui regis reverentiae est (Darius to Tyriotes, who has brought news of defeat); 7, 8, 29 Iurando gratiam Scythas sancire ne credideris: colendo fidem iurant (Scythian envoy to Alexander); 8, 7, 15 Quorum orbas senectutem, suppliciis ne oneraveris (Hermolaus to Alexander); 9, 2, 29 Ne infregeritis in manibus meis palmam, qua Herculem Liberumque patrem, si invidia afuerit, aequabo (Alexander to his soldiers); Luc. 8, 451 Ne (nec V) iura fidemque Respectumque deum veteri speraveris aula (Lentulus to Pompey, speaking of the Egyptian court); Val. Flac. 5, 507 Tu modo ne claros Minyis invideris actus (Jason to Aeetes, asking an alliance); 7, 415 Ne, precor, infando similem te, virgo, parenti, Gesseris; haut tales decet inclementia vultus (Jason to Medea); Mart. 7, 10, 8 Septingenta Tito debet Lupus: Ole, quid ad te? Assem ne dederis crediderisve Lupo; 7, 60, 6 Nil pro me mihi, Iuppiter, petenti ne suscensueris vel superbo; Tac. Hist. 1, 16 Ne tamen territus fueris, si duae legiones in hoc concussi orbis motu nondum quiescunt (Galba to Piso on his adoption); Hist. 2, 77 Ne tamen Mucianum socium spreveris, quia aemulum non experiris. Me Vitellio antepono, te mihi (Mucianus to Vespasian); Plin. 6, 17, 4 Disertior ipse es? tanto magis ne invideris: nam qui invidet minor est (Pliny to his friend Restitutus); 9, 21, 3 Remitte aliquid adulescentiae ipsius, remitte lacrimis, remitte indulgentiae tuae: ne torseris illum, ne torseris etiam te (Pliny to Sabinianus, regarding the latter's freedman); Pany. 62 Ne respexeris clandestinas existimationes nullisque magis quam audientibus insidiantes susurros.

2. With *nec* or *neu*, preceded by an imperative or volitive subjunctive.—Here *nec* must be regarded as equivalent to *neve* (*neu*). Luc. 7, 591 Ne rue per medios nimium temerarius hostis, Nec tibi fatales admoveris ante Philippos Thessalia periture tua (Address to Pompey); 9, 1026 Crede ... nec vile putaris Hoc meritum, nobis facili quod caede peractum est (The messenger from the Egyptian king brings Pompey's head to Caesar); Val. Flac. 1, 176 Cuncta parato; In quaecumque vocas; Nec nos, ait,

Digitized by Google

optume, segnes Credideris patriisve magis confidere regnis Quam tibi (Acastus to Jason); 5, 539 Quare age cognatas primum defendite sedes Nec decus oblati dismiseris advena belli (Reply of Aeetes to Jason); Stat. Theb. 9, 890 Decipito; neu tu subitus neve arma tenenti veneris (Dryas to Dorceus, who is to bear to his mother the news of his death); Mart. 5, 34, 10 Mollia non rigidus caespes tegat ossa, nec illi, Terra, gravis fueris: non fuit illa tibi (On the little slave-girl, Erotion); 6, 64, 28 Sed miserere tui, rabido nec perditus ore Fumantem nasum vivi temptaveris ursi (To a critic).

3. With *neque* (*nec*).—Ps.-Quint. 50, 16 (Ritter) Neque enim hoc tu spectaveris, quod cum uxore non diu vixi (Son's plea when compelled to divorce his wife); Tac. Hist. 2, 47 Nec tempus conputaveritis: difficilius est temperare felicitati, qua te non putes diu usurum (Otho to his soldiers); Hist. 2, 76 Nec speciem adulantis expaveris: a contumelia quam a propius fuerit post Vitellium eligi (Mucianus to Vespasian).

4. With *cave*.—Curt. Ruf. 5, 2, 21 Cave, obsecro, in contumeliam acceperis ignorationem meam (Alexander apologizing to Sisigambis for his conduct).

5. With *vide* (*ne*).—Ps.-Quint. 376, 6 Vide, ne rogaveris. Insanus sum (Father to son, who has failed to win him over).

6. With *minime*.—Curt. Ruf. 5, 2, 15 Minime vero haec feceris, rex, sed omen quoque accipe (Philotas to Alexander, who wished to remove Darius' table).

Elmer's theory will not apply in the following passages:

1. With *ne*.—Phaedr. App. 26, 5 Ne timueris; Late securus (Countryman to hare); Mart. 2, 68, 3 Quod te nomine iam tuo saluto, Quem regem et dominum prius vocabam, Ne me dixeris esse contumacem (To Olus); Tac. Ann. 6, 8 Ne, patres conscripti, ultimum Seiani diem, sed sedecim annos cogitaveritis (Speech of Terentius); Plin. 1, 18, 5 Quod dubitas, ne feceris (Precept); Cato 1, 30, 1 Quae culpare soles, ea tu ne feceris ipse (Precept); 3, 7, 1 Alterius dictum aut factum ne carpseris umquam (Precept); Coll. 47 Minorem ne contempseris (Precept); 3, 241, 25[1] Quod tibi non optes, alii ne feceris ulli (Precept).

2. With *nec* preceded by an imperative or subjunctive.—Pers. 1, 7 Non castiges . . . nec te quaesiveris extra (Persius to his

[1] In several passages from Bährens, it is impossible to give an exact reference by title. Such passages are cited, as in the present instance, by the volume, page and line of the selection. Several passages from Ausonius are cited in the same way.

Digitized by Google

friend); Mart. 14, 218, 2 Dic quotus et quanti cupias cenare nec unum addideris verbum: cena parata tibi est (To the *obsonator*); Plin. 8, 24, 5 Absit superbia asperitas. Nec timueris contemptum (Pliny to his friend Maximus); Nemes. Cyn. 166 Sed neque conclusos teneas neque vincula collo Inpatiens circumdederis (Advice on the care of puppies); Cato 2, 16, 1 Nec te conlaudes nec te culpaveris ipse (Precept).

3. With *nec* preceded by an indicative.—Juv. 14, 48 Maxima debetur puero reverentia, si quid Turpe paras, nec tu pueri contempseris annos, Sed peccaturo obstet tibi filius infans (Precept).

4. With *nullus* preceded by an imperative.—Ps.-Quint. 235, 24 Colite, homines, innocentiam et nullam spem inpunitatis ex secreto scelerum conceperitis.

5. With *nec*.—Luc. 1, 53 Sed neque in arctoo sedem tibi legeris orbe (Lucan to Nero); Ps.-Quint. 22, 3–6 Neque enim eum, qui non vicit, negaveris pugnasse; neque eum, qui fructus non percepit, negaveris possedisse; aut eum, qui naufragium fecit, negaveris navigasse; Mart. 5, 6, 16 Nec porrexeris ista sed teneto, Sic tanquam nihil offeras agasque (To his book).

6. With *nemo*.—Cato, Coll. 1, 31 Neminem riseris (Precept).

7. With *nullus*.—Cato 3, 10, 2 Si prodest, sensum nullius tempseris unquam (Precept).

8. With *nihil*.—Tac. Ann. 16, 22 Denique nihil ipse de Thrasea scripseris: disceptatorem senatum nobis relinque (Cossutianus to Nero); Cato, Coll. 24 Nihil temere credideris (Precept); Coll. 48 Nihil arbitrio virium feceris (Precept).

9. With *numquam*.—Cato 2, 29, 1 Iudicium populi numquam contempseris unus (Precept); 4, 41, 1 Damnaris numquam post longum tempus amicum (Precept).

Elmer repeatedly emphasizes the absence of verbs of mental action in the perfect in prohibitions as one of the strongest arguments in support of his theory, in fact one of the three things that make up his theory. Thus he says (A. J. P. XV 152): "In the whole history of the Latin language, from the earliest times down to and including Livy, there are to be found in prohibitions expressed by *ne* with the perfect subjunctive only two, or at most three, verbs denoting mere mental activity, viz. *ne dubitaris* (Cic. ad Att. 7, 3, 2), *ne metueritis* (de rep. 1, 19, 32), *ne curaris* (ad Att. 4, 15, 6)." There is certainly a fourth instance which has escaped the notice of both Elmer and Bennett, *ne curassis*, Poen. 552, the only example of a verb of purely mental action with *ne*

Digitized by Google

in the perfect in prohibitions in Plautus.[1] While I can not agree with Elmer in his contention that verbs of mental action can not be used in the strongest kind of prohibitions, we must admit that, regarding the three instances of *nil curassis* cited by Bennett (p. 65) as prohibitions, the proportion of such verbs is very small in the dramatists. Accepting the instances with *nec*, *nihil* and the like, the proportion becomes, as Bennett has shown, a very respectable one in Cicero and the poets of the Augustan age. It is surprising to note the number of different verbs, notably those of non-mental action, that appear in the perfect in prohibitions. Most of them occur but once or twice. While I have made no systematic count of them, I feel quite safe in saying that *dixis*, *feceris* and *fueris* are the most frequent and common to all periods, while the authors we are considering employ nearly as many as those of the entire period preceding and ending with Livy. In the 57 prohibitions that have been cited, 41 different verbs are found. Of these, 16 express mental action, occurring in 22 passages. Such a percentage of verbs and passages is out of all proportion to the total verbs of both classes in the language. Even omitting the instances that Elmer would perhaps class as those of obligation or propriety, the percentage will be changed but little. I am confident that additional prose examples will confirm these results.[2] The theory as to the absence of verbs of mental action in the perfect subjunctive in prohibitions is plainly untenable for Silver Latin, as I believe it is for the entire history of the language. Its infrequency in the dramatists may be explained in various ways. A theory as ingenious might be advanced to explain the absence of certain verbs of non-mental action in authors or periods.

Elmer's contention that *ne* with the perfect never occurs in dignified or deferential address does not appear valid in the light of a number of the preceding examples. When personages of rank or distinction (or in one instance a god) are addressed, the

[1] Elmer in his last article (p. 91) still ignores this passage, for he says: "I did say that no such instances occur in Plautus, and I still believe it to be true." If *curaris* is a verb of mental action in Cicero, as Elmer apparently admits, *curassis* in Plautus must certainly be of similar character. Its importance is considerable in its bearing on Elmer's contention, for we have an example of a usage whose existence Elmer has vigorously denied.

[2] Thus, I have noted, in a small portion of Seneca's prose, Ad Marc. De Cons. 5, 5 *ne concupieris*, and Ad Polyb. De Cons. 9, 7 *ne invideris*.

Digitized by Google

tone must be deferential, however great the excitement under which the speaker is laboring at the time, or the earnestness with which he speaks.

I can not assent to Elmer and Bennett's conclusions that *ne* with the perfect was essentially a colloquialism as far as Silver Latin is concerned. This may be true of some authors, but one can hardly regard its appearance in the epic writers, the speeches of Curtius Rufus or Tacitus or Pliny's panegyric on Trajan as an example of colloquial usage.

Sixteen of the prohibitions (mostly from Cato) are addressed to an indefinite person. *Cave* (*ne*), which was used with the perfect in Plautus and Terence more frequently than *ne*, occurs but once. It is not cited in the examples given from Cicero and the Augustan writers.

II. *The Present Subjunctive.*

The following examples conform to Elmer's theory of the absence of special emotion, as he defines it, in prohibitions expressed by the present subjunctive.

1. With *ne*.—Gratt. Cyn. 190 ne aspernere; Sen. Phaedr. 766 ne(u) suspicias; 4, 74, 1 (Bährens) ne mirere; Calp. 3, 75 ne dubites; Mart. 1, 70, 13 ne metuas; 4, 59, 5 ne placeas; 7, 26, 2 ne accedas; 9, 61, 20 ne metuas; Introd. to Bk. XII, ne mireris; 13, 66, 1 ne violes; 14, 97, 3 ne spernas; Plin. Trai. 40, 3 ne existimes; Juv. 15, 89 ne quaeras et dubites; Cato 1, 17, 1 ne cures; 1, 22, 1 ne timeas; 1, 25, 2 ne sis; 2, 31, 1 ne cures; 3, 2, 1 ne cures; 3, 21, 1 ne videaris; 4, 22, 1 ne cures; 4, 38, 2 ne credas; 4, 45, 2 ne quaeras; Auson. 29, 6 (Peiper) ne praetereas; 207, 29 ne mireris; 262, 24 ne metuas; 309, 2 ne reputes; Avian. 1, 11 ne mireris; Vincent. 4, 361, 10 ne metuas; Felix. 4, 338, 7 ne praestes; Incert. 3, 306, 8 ne credas; Incert. 4, 308, 5 ne dubites; Incert. 5, 105, 2 ne exagites; Perdic. 182 ne dubites; Priap. 44, 4 ne dubitetis.

2. With *neu* or *nec* preceded by an imperative or subjunctive. —Sen. H. F. 1085 preme . . . nec linquas (linquat); Pers. 3, 73 disce nec invideas; Mart. 1, 117, 13 pete nec roges; 12, 14, 2 utaris nec eas; Cato 1, 12, 1 fuge neu studeas; 2, 30, 2 sit nec culpes; 3, 24, 2 diligito nec offendas; Auson. Mos. 428 propellite neu vereare; 419, 4 mitte nec exprobres; Incert. 5, 83, 3 memento nec metuas; Incert. 5, 97, 4 mitte nec exprobres.

Digitized by Google

3. With *nec* or *neu*.—Sen. H. O. 764 nec (neu) credas; Pers. 5, 158 nec dicas; Stat. Silv. 1, 1, 17 nec putes; Mart. 10, 47, 13 nec metuas nec optes; 10, 70, 11 nec possis; 13, 10, 1 nec possis; Juv. 3, 302 nec metuas; 8, 189 nec ignoscas; 9, 99 nec contemnas aut despicias; 14, 203 neu credas; Tac. Ann. 3, 50 nec metuas; Nemes. Cyn. 165 neque teneas; 166 noceasque; Cato 2, 16, 1 nec conlaudes; Maxim. 1, 143 nec possis; Vitalis 4, 150, 1 nec tenearis; Dracont. 5, 216, 7 nec quaeras.

4. With *cave* (*ne*).—Gratt. Cyn. 50 ne subeat cave; Mart. 6, 79, 1 Sciat caveto; 7, 15, 6 ne velit, cave; 10, 72, 13 caveto loquaris; Plin. 5, 10, 2 cave ne extorqueant; Apul. 11, 12 (Vliet) cave transeas; 183, 26 cave ne exedas; Auson. 343, 4 ne decipiare cave.

5. With *vide* (*ne*).—Phaedr. 3, 6, 3 vide ne conpungam; Mart. 6, 21, 4 ne quid pecces, vide; 10, 19, 13 ne pulses, videto; 14, 131, 2 ne fias, vide; Cato 4, 25, 2 vide ne damnes; Avit. 4, 258, 2 ne laedas vide ne repugnes.

6. With *non*.—Pers. 1, 6 non accedas examenque castiges; 5, 45 non dubites; Cato, App. 76 non pecces; 3, 240, 4 non laedas; Asclep. 4, 141, 30 non dedigneris.

7. With *nihil*.—Juv. 4, 22 nil expectes; Apul. 208, 29 nihil metuas; Auson. 4, 7 nil dubites; 312, 9 nihil metuas; Cato 3, 242, 33 nil facias.

8. With *numquam*.—Cato 3, 242, 35 Improperes numquam.

The following presents display emotion that Elmer's theory would not lead us to expect in prohibitions employing this tense:

1. With *ne*.—Phaedr. App. 26, 4 Per superos oro perque spes omnes tuas, Ne me indices, bubulce; nihil umquam mali Huic agro feci (Hare to countryman); Curt. Ruf. 6, 3, 12 Ne vos magno labore credatis Bessum vacuum regnum occupaturum (Alexander to his soldiers); 9, 2, 28 Per vos gloriamque vestram, qua humanum fastigium exceditis, perque et mea in vos et in me vestra merita, quibus invicti contendimus, oro quaesoque, ne humanarum rerum terminos adeuntem alumnum commilitonemque vestrum, ne dicam regem, deseratis (Alexander to his soldiers); Pers. 3, 96 Ne sis mihi tutor (Invalid to friend); 5, 170 Ne trepidare velis (Davus to his master); Il. Lat. 330 Moneo, ne rursus inique Illius tua fata velis committere dextrae (Helen to Paris); 724 Nunc vos per numina divum, Per mare, per Ditis fluctus obtestor opaci, Ne rapere hanc animam crudeli caede velitis (Dolon to Ulysses

Digitized by Google

and Diomed); Stat. Theb. 3, 241 Vos o superi, meus ordine sanguis, Ne pugnare odiis neu me temptare precando Certetis (Jupiter to the gods); 3, 665 Ne mihi tunc, moneo, lituos atque arma volenti Obvius ire pares (Capaneus to Amphiaraus); 6, 893 Ne, precor, ante aciem ius tantum casibus esse Fraternisque sinas (abigant hoc numina!) votis (Adrastus to Tydeus, eager to engage in single combat); Sllv. 4, 9, 55 Tantum ne mihi, quo soles lepore, Et nunc hendecasyllabos remittas (Statius to Grypus); Mart. 11, 55, 2 Hortatur fieri quod te Lupus, Urbice, patrem, Ne credas; nihil est, quod minus ille velit; Ps.-Quint. 201, 9 Ne quid inprobe petas, ne videaris isto animo litigasse (Father to son); Vespa 62 Illi ne credas aliquid (Cook to Vulcan, who is deciding a contest); Apul. 19, 3 Ergo brevitatem gurgustioli nostri ne spernas, peto (Milo to Lucius); 169, 24–26 Quovis alio felicius maritare, modo ne in Thrasylli manum sacrilegam convenias, neve sermonem conferas, nec mensam accumbas nec toro adquiescas (Shade of the murdered Tlepolemus to his wife); Auson. 296, 83 In hoc reponentem omnia Ne, quaeso, segnem neve perversum putes nec crimineris impium (To Paulinus, referring to himself); 301, 190 Ne me igitur, venerande parens his ut male versum Increpites studiis neque me vel coniuge carpas vel mentis vitio (Same persons as preceding passage); Avian. 9, 23 Ne facile alterius repetas consortia (Bear to traveller deserted by his companion); Dracont. 5, 148, 273. 276 Ne viscera matris Transadigas gladio, laceres ne membra parentis. Civilia colla ne ferias (Poor man to rich); Incert. 3, 300, 6 Ne nostra feras de regione pedem (To Isis).

2. With *nec* or *neve* preceded by an imperative or subjunctive. —Sen. Troad. 562 Libera Graios metu . . . Neve crudelem putes Quod sorte iussus Hectoris gnatum petam. Petissem Oresten (Ulysses, with assumed feeling, to Andromache); Luc. 2, 637 Concute. Nec Pharnacis arma relinquas (Pompey to his son); Sil. Ital. 17, 367 Vitamque remittas Neve sinas captum Ausonias perferre catenas (Juno, pleading with Jupiter for Hannibal); Mart. 1, 35, 14 Parcas lusibus et iocis, rogamus, Nec castrare velis meos libellos (To Cornelius, who criticised the immoral tone of his works); 10, 78, 15 Sic inter veteres legar poetas, nec multos mihi praeferas priores, Uno sed tibi sim minor Catullo (To his friend Macer); Apul. 56, 17 Immo vero licet maius quodvis supplicium sume, nec tamen me putes, oro, sponte angorem istum tibi concinasse (Fotis to Lucius); 89, 3 Bono animo esto, mi erilis, nec vanis somniorum figmentis terreare (Aged servant to her

Digitized by Google

mistress); 93, 8 Siste puellam . . . nec speres generum mortali stirpe creatum (Order to Psyche's father); 113, 13 Ergo mihi ausculta nec te rursus praecipitio vel ullo mentis accersito genere perimas (Pan to Psyche); 146, 3 Nec me putetis egenum vel abiectum neve de pannulis istis virtutes meas aestimetis (Captive to robbers); 256, 7 Exue nec quicquam rerum earum reformides ut arduum (Venus to Lucius); Auson. 261, 13 Disce libens: tetrici nec praeceptoris habenas Detestere, nepos; 289, 7 Parce, precor, lacerare tuum, nec amara paternis, Admiscere velis, ceu melle absinthia, verbis (To Paulinus); 299, 154 Unde, precor, meliora putes nec maxima perdas Praemia detestando tuis bona fontibus orta (To Paulinus); 309, 11 Oro libens sumas, nec vilia dedigneris Quae sunt parva (To Gestidius); Incert. 3, 273, 15 Expectes oro neve interimas me (Father to son).

3. With *nec* preceded by an indicative.—Mart. 1, 54, 4 Unum, si superest, locum rogamus, nec me, quod tibi sum novus, recuses (To Fuscus, asking to be enrolled among his friends); Tac. Ann. 6, 8 Abditos principis sensus, et si quid occultius parat, inlicitum, anceps; nec ideo adsequare (Speech of Terentius).

4. With *nec.*—Mart. 4, 20, 3 Ferre nec hanc possis, possis, Colline, nec illam (Caerellia and Gellia's faults are under discussion); Apul. 49, 10 Nec me putetis privatis simultatibus instinctum odio proprio saevire (Nightguard to jurors); 63, 23 Nec istud factum putes ulla benivolentia sed ut ei redeunti medela salubri possem subsistere (Fotis tells Lucius of power given her by her mistress); 98, 11 Quarum (i. e. sororum), si quas forte lamentationes acceperis, neque respondeas immo nec prospicias omnino; ceterum mihi quidem gravissimum dolorem, tibi vero summum creabis exitium (Cupid to Psyche); 103, 21 Neque omnino conferas et certe de marito nil quicquam vel audias vel respondeas (Cupid to Psyche. Upon the manner in which the order is obeyed will depend the divine or human nature of their child); 104, 18 Nec illas scelestas feminas vel videas vel audias (Cupid to Psyche); 126, 24 Psyche, tantis aerumnis exercita, neque tua miserrima morte meas sanctas aquas polluas nec vero istud horae contra formidabiles oves feras aditum (The reeds in the river to Psyche, who was about to throw herself into the stream); 131, 17 Nec tu tamen inlicita adflectare pietate (Tower to Psyche, regarding old man's request to be taken into Charon's boat); 131, 22 Nec putes futtile istud polentacium damnum leve (Tower to Psyche).

5. With *cave* (*ne*).—Curt. Ruf. 4, 1, 22 Et cum in regali solio

Digitized by Google

residebis, vitae necisque omnium civium dominus, cave obliviscaris habitus, in quo accipis regnum, immo, hercule, propter quem (One of the messengers to Abdalonymus, upon offering him the kingdom); 4, 10, 26 Vultus tuus nescio quod ingens malum praefert, sed cave miseri hominis auribus parcas: didici esse infelix, et saepe calamitatis solacium est nosse sortem suam (Darius to messenger bringing news of defeat); 7, 8, 28 Quos viceris, amicos tibi esse cave ne credas: inter dominum et servum nulla amicitia est (Scythian envoy to Alexander); Mart. 6, 78, 3 Bibas caveto: Vinum si biberis, nihil videbis (Heras, the physician, to his patient. Disobedience brought the predicted result); 11, 102, 7 Audiat aedilis ne te videatque caveto (Jesting = serious warning to Lydia); Apul. 30, 6 Cave ne nimia mellis dulcedine diutinam bilis amaritudinem contrahas (Jesting speech of Fotis to Lucius).

6. *Cave (ne)* preceded by an imperative.—Stat. Theb. 11, 111 Impelle nefas; neu mitis Adrastus Praevaleat plebesque, cave, Lernaea moretur (Tisiphone to her sister Megaera, summoned to her aid from the underworld).

7. With *vide (ne)*.—Phaedr. App. 10, 14 Vide, ne querela maior accrescat domus (Aesop to a father); Sen. Oed. 857 Ne te parentis pigeat inventi vide (Old man to Oedipus); Med. 532 IAS. Alta timesco sceptra. MED. Ne cupias vide; Curt. Ruf. 7, 8, 14 Stultus est, qui fructus earum (i. e. magnarum arborum) spectat, altitudinem non metitur. Vide, ne, dum ad cacumen pervenire contendis, cum ipsis ramis, quos conprehenderis, decidas (Scythian envoy to Alexander); Pers. 1, 109 Videsis, ne maiorum tibi forte limina frigescant (Friend to Persius).

Elmer, in giving the test-question which has been asked in connection with the preceding 168 prohibitions in the subjunctive present, says: "You will find the answer will be 'No!' almost without exception." If I have erred in my conclusions, it has been on the side of conservatism, and Professor Elmer's theory has been given the benefit of every doubt. Yet, instead of the few exceptions we were told might be met with, 78 of the prohibitions (44 per cent.) do not accord with the theory at all. This in itself is surprising; but the result is still more startling, if we take another step, as we are justified in doing. It will be generally admitted that precepts or prohibitions addressed to no particular person can not be tested with any degree of exactness by such a question. All such prohibitions, therefore, have been regarded as non-emotional (I use the word and its opposite in the sense given by Professor Elmer). The prohibitions in the perfect

Digitized by Google

subjunctive would be reduced to 41 and the non-emotional to 12, instead of 27, as at present. This strengthens the perfect side of the theory, though it will be admitted that 27 per cent. of non-emotional perfects is a proportion that seriously discredits it. Deducting the 47 presents of a similar character, we have 121 remaining, of which 76, or 63 per cent., are in opposition to the theory. Either percentage is fatal to the theory's validity. Let us take a few examples at random to determine what the results were, or would be if there was a failure to comply with the prohibition. The patient disobeyed the physician, drank, and became blind. Psyche looked out, saw and listened to her sisters, with disastrous results. The hare would have lost its life. Alexander would have been deserted by his troops, would have fallen from his pinnacle of greatness. The gods would have been at war. Tlepolemus' wife would have shown courtesy to her husband's murderer and even married him. Hannibal would have been thrown into chains. Psyche would have thrown herself from the tower, or into the river, or would have approached dangerous animals. Lucius would have remained an ass. The son would have killed his father. Darius would have been left in anxious expectation. Each of these results was or would have been certainly "a disaster of some sort to one's interests or feelings"—a serious disaster. Possibly one fourth of the examples have been considered; the remainder could be tested with the same emphatic results. It can be plainly shown, even in the examples where verbs of mental action appear, that a large number, if not a majority, of prohibitions in the present subjunctive, tried by Professor Elmer's test, do not conform to his theory at all. Supposing his theory of the emotional nature of the perfect in prohibitions had been proven to be without exception, these examples from the present show that neither tense can claim an exclusive emotional monopoly. Strong emotion is expressed in prohibitions in Latin by both the present and perfect subjunctive, and I believe it is impossible to establish any definite rule with regard to the use of the two tenses.

Another objection to Elmer's theory as to the distinction in force between the two tenses, raised by Professor Bennett in his criticism of the Plautine examples, can be urged in Silver Latin as well. In three passages (Curt. Ruf. 9, 2, 28. 29; Nemes. Cyn. 165; Cato 2, 16, 1), present and perfect occur with no apparent difference in force; in a fourth, Tac. Ann. 6, 8, the present is apparently emotional, the perfect the reverse, while in Curt. Ruf.

Digitized by Google

7, 8, 28. 29 we have the present and perfect of the same verb (*cave ne credas*, *ne credideris*) in the same speech, the only difference being that the present is probably the more emphatic of the two!

In these present subjunctive prohibitions 112 different verbs occur, 46 being those of mental action. Of the 168 prohibitions, 97 are verbs of mental action, a percentage considerably larger than in Plautus and Terence, where Elmer states that about one third of the examples are of this class.

The present, which yielded to *noli* with the imperative in Cicero, has recovered its position again.

Seventy-two per cent. of the prohibitions are addressed to a definite person, including all the prose examples. It is interesting to note that the critics and later writers on the prohibitive regard Professor Elmer as the original overthrower of Madvig's theory, either ignorant or forgetful of the fact that Professor Hale (A. J. P. IX 162), six years before the appearance of Elmer's papers, had shown that Madvig's theory did not apply to Plautus.

Dräger's statement with regard to *cave (ne)* (Hist. Syn. I 326): "Die Verbindung mit der ersten und dritten Person des Conjunktivs kommt seit der klassischen Zeit nicht mehr vor," is incorrect. Eight examples with the third person have been cited.

III. *The Imperative.*

A. With *ne.*

Gratt. Cyn. 125 ne relinquite; Consol. Liv. 247 nec repugna; 248 nec morare; 249 nec destrue; 470 nec crede; Germ. Prog. 4, 54 nec crede; 55 nec puta; Sen. H. F. 660 neve frauda; Thy. 94 ne violate; 95 neve adspergite; 917 ne parce; 984 ne metue; Phoen. 133 ne verere; 193 ne erue; 195 neve everte; 283 ne metue; Phaed. 137 neve praebe; 227 ne crede; 1002 ne metue; 1249 ne metue; Troad. 720 nec puta; Med. 608 nec rumpe; 1024 ne propera; Aga. 833 ne metue; 1062 ne trahite; H. O. 1377 nec trepida; Octav. 259 neve nova; Pers. 6, 66 neu dicta; Luc. 1, 94 nec credite; 2, 39 neve differte; 5, 492 ne retine; 5, 536 ne cessa; 5, 588 ne flecte; 6, 773 ne parce; 6, 812 ne quaere; 7, 24 ne rumpite; 7, 328 ne parcite; 7, 590 ne rue; 8, 627 ne cede; 9, 613 ne dubita; 9, 982 ne tangere; 9, 1082 nec credite; Calp. 2, 60 ne contemne; 4, 78 ne dubita; 4, 146 ne desere; 7, 20 nec desere; Nemes. 1, 81 ne desere; 4, 44 ne perde; Cyn. 185 nec indulge; Val. Flac. 1, 215 nec desere; 1, 526 ne pande; 2, 251 ne quaere;

Digitized by Google

2, 596 ne defice; 4, 125 ne crede; 4, 218 ne ferte; 4, 477 nec credite; 4, 581 ne inpende; 4, 592 ne defice; 4, 603 nec crede; 5, 502 nec adi; 5, 589 ne sperne; 6, 539 neve finge; 7, 226 neu argue; 7, 287 ne falle; 7, 449 ne crede; 8, 12 ne crede; 8, 436 ne cede; Sil. Ital. 1, 636 ne crede; 2, 30 ne deposce; 2, 700 neu rumpite; 2, 701 nec postferte; 3, 146 ne exhorresce; 5, 87 ne dedignare; 5, 117 ne fingite; 5, 317 ne desere; 6, 538 ne cessa; 9, 32 ne expectate; 11, 358 ne sperne; 11, 591 ne spoliate; 12, 329 neu date; 13, 284 ne rumpite; 13, 874 ne metue; 14, 168 ne precare; 15, 161 ne sperne; 15, 191 ne capesse; 16, 127 ne capesse; 16, 670 ne fabricate; 17, 29 nec miscete; 17, 445 ne prodite; Stat. Theb. 1, 688 ne perge; 2, 118 nec sine; 2, 160 ne credite; 3, 301 ne gaude; 3, 311 ne concipe; 3, 715 nec desine; 4, 513 ne spernite; 4, 537 ne vulgata; 4, 599 ne saevite; 4, 642 ne trepida; 5, 670 neve indulgete; 5, 750 ne violate, ne plangite; 6, 167 nec vocate; 8, 94 neve dignare; 8, 325 ne rape; 8, 326 ne propera; 8, 328 neu praecipe; 9, 660 nec perge; 10, 696 ne crede; 10, 703 ne permitte; 10, 708 ne perge; 11, 390 ne incesse; 12, 203 ne revocate; 12, 595 nec crede; 12, 762 ne crede; 12, 816 nec tempta; Ach. 1, 80 ne pete; 1, 358 neve concede; 1, 392 ne admitte; 1, 534 ne cede; 1, 941 nec memento; Silv. 1, 5, 10 ne labora; 2, 2, 142 nec demitte; 2, 6, 12 ne conprime; 4, 1, 29 nec recense; 5, 1, 179 nec concute; Mart. 3, 2, 12 nec timeto; 3, 26, 5 ne puta; 4, 14, 11 nec lege; 5, 48, 7 ne propera, ne crede; 6, 27, 5 ne parce; 7, 93, 7 nec abutere; 8, 59, 3 ne contemne; 12, 55, 3 ne date; 13, 110, 2 nec sume; 14, 97, 1 ne viola; 14, 177, 3 ne sperne; Juv. 9, 130 ne trepida; Plin. 8, 18, 11 ne gravare; Cato 1, 2 neu esto; 1, 35 ne dubita; 2, 2 ne quaere; 3, 1 ne cessa; Mono. 75 ne crede; Col. 28 nec laede; Ser. Sam. L. M. 895 nec crede; Auson. 2, 39 ne temne; 31, 1 ne desere; 71, 8 ne quaere; 80, 5 ne fidite; 192, 83 ne horresce; 284, 32 nec dedignare; Sen. 4, 81, 13 ne cessate; Petron. 4, 90, 3 ne succumbe; Octav. 4, 255, 276 ne caedite; Regian. 4, 359, 1 ne crede; Luxor. 4, 394, 3 ne quaere; Avian. 26, 4 nec quaere; Orest. Trag. 486 ne dubitate; 657 ne dubitate; Priap. 14, 2 ne puta; 77, 17 neve inponite.

In these 163 examples, 95 different verbs are represented, 30 being those of mental action, found in 72 passages.

Nulli with the imperative is found in Phaedr. App. 6, 15 and Juv. 6, 631, in both instances with *credite.*

Nihil with the imperative is found twice in Cato (1, 8, 1 nihil crede; Coll. 44 nihil mentire).

Digitized by Google

Minime iudica occurs Cato, Coll. 52.

Plin. 8, 18, 11 ne gravare is the only prose example.

Every syntactical work with which I am familiar, except Lane (§1582), states that *non* does not occur with the imperative after Ovid. Lane says it occurs a few times, but gives no examples. I have noted four instances: Sen. H. F. 589 Tu non ante tuam respice coniugem quam cum clara deos optulerit dies Spartanique aderit ianua Taenari; Calp. 5, 24 Sed non ante greges in pascua mitte reclusos Quam fuerit placata Pales; Il. Lat. 1037 Non (ne V) vitam mihi nec magnos concede favores; Cato 3, 241, 6 Eripe, si valeas, non suggere tela furenti.

B. *Noli* with the Infinitive.

Seventy-two examples of *noli* have been noted, 32 being with verbs of mental action. With *noli* 59 different verbs occur, 26 of which are those of mental action. The number of instances and the percentage of verbs of mental action are much smaller than in Cicero. There, as Elmer has shown, *noli* encroached upon the present subjunctive. The examples are: Phaedr. 1, 22, 8 noli imputare; 1, 25, 7 noli vereri; 2, 3, 4 noli facere; 3, 18, 14 noli adfectare; 4, 7, 23 noli esse; Curt. Ruf. 9, 2, 26 nolite amittere; Calp. 3, 90 nolite credere; Stat. Silv. 2, 7, 35 noli provocare; Mart. 1, 24, 4 nolito credere; 1, 91, 2 noli carpere; Introd. to Bk. II, noli facere, noli inducere; 2, 74, 4 nolito invidere; 3, 31, 5 noli fastidire; 4, 38, 2 noli negare; 5, 57, 1 noli placere; 7, 76, 5 nolito placere; 9, 9, 3 noli queri; 10, 90, 9 noli vellere; 11, 13, 2 noli praeterire; 11, 14, 1 nolite sepelire; Ps.-Quint. 13, 21 noli mirari; 136, 5 nolite aestimare; 154, 16 noli desperare; 240, 24 nolite dare; 333, 9 nolite quaerere; 415, 25 noli dicere; 417, 12 noli opponere; 440, 19 noli criminari; Juv. 1, 126 noli vexare; 6, 378 noli committere; Plin. 4, 27, 4 noli amare; Apul. 169, 26 noli auspicari; Cato 3, 216, 52 noli inridere; 1, 9 noli desistere; 1, 10 noli contendere; 1, 13 noli promittere; 1, 14 noli credere; 1, 19 noli ponere; 1, 23 noli incusare; 1, 27 noli probare; 1, 32 noli praeponere; 2, 4 noli contendere; 2, 9 noli contemnere; 2, 11 noli contendere; 2, 12 noli perquirere; 2, 15 noli referre; 2, 20 nolito credere; 2, 21 noli ignoscere; 2, 25 noli submittere; 2, 26 noli dimittere; 3, 15 nolito silere; 3, 20 noli timere; 4, 3 noli dicere; 4, 10 noli indulgere; 4, 18 noli ridere; 4, 34 noli contendere; 4, 35 noli maerere; 4, 37 noli promittere; 4, 46 noli gaudere; App. 2 noli dimittere; App. 6 noli haberi; App. 8 noli dicere; Col. 16 noli adsuescere; Col. 30 noli attendere; Col. 40

Digitized by Google

noli dimittere; Auson. 267, 36 noli exigere; Sen. 4, 63, 9 noli tangere; Gall. 4, 104, 4 nolite extinguere; Maxim. 5, 67 noli parcere; Priap. 44, 1 nolite putare; 79, 3 noli erubescere.

In the Disticha of Cato we find the richest mine of prohibitive expressions presented in any single author in the language. In 476 lines occur 78 distinct prohibitions of 14 different types. *Noli* predominates, appearing in 40 per cent. of the passages. Light is also cast upon the subjunctive of obligation or propriety, as we find excellent examples of the perfect with *nemo*, *nullus*, *nihil* and *numquam*, and of the present with *non*, *nihil* and *numquam*, in expressions that are clearly prohibitions.

Elmer, in the closing words of his second article (A. J. P. XV 327), says: "As regards the use of *non* in Silver Latin, I believe that it still continued to be carefully distinguished from *ne*." It has been shown that *non* occurs in prohibitions with the present subjunctive and imperative. It is reasonable to suppose that its use was not confined to these two types. I have noted in my reading a number of passages where it occurs with the first and third persons, where the expression is clearly volitive. In most cases there are subjunctives in immediate connection which can not be explained as of obligation. The passages are: Sen. Thy. 48 non sit; 185 non tegant; Med. 513 non veniat; H. O. 1593 non horreat; Luc. 7, 322 non commoveant; 8, 738 non desint; Calp. 5, 39 non pudeat; Val. Flac. 4, 610 non sit; 5, 57 non dividat; Mart. 5, 34, 9 non tegat; Juv. 6, 448 non habeat; 6, 451 non intellegat; 16, 28 non sollicitemus; Plin. 3, 19, 9 non moveat; Ser. Sam. 899 non pudeat; Auson. 307, 13 non adfligar, aut crescam; Namat. 1, 263 non deceant; 1, 413 non indignemur; Dracont. 5, 146, 228 non micent, non surgant; 202, 291 non coniungatur; 207, 420 non puniat; Cato 4, 29, 1 non pudeat; Mono. 2 non extollant, non frangant.

There are other points in connection with the prohibitive, outside of Silver Latin, which I hope to consider at another time. There is a solution, I believe, of the seeming difficulties or inconsistencies of usage in Cicero and the poets of the Augustan age which has not yet been suggested. It would be rash to venture an explanation before a more thorough examination of the problems involved than I have yet been able to give.

WILLARD K. CLEMENT.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,
June 2, 1900.

Digitized by Google

IV.—NOTES ON SERVIUS.

The following notes consider a few questions not directly connected with a comparison of the Servius and Scholia of Daniel, although there seems to be a difference in lexicographical knowledge shown by each, and corruptions in the text are chiefly found in the Scholia. The most important question presented—the religion of Servius—is really a question of Biblical criticism, but we have touched on it only as it refers to Servius.

I. *The Religion of Servius.*

The impression made by some passages is that the commentaries are not from a Christian source. This impression, however, comes not from what is said in explanation of religious views, but from the presentation of some statements which, it would seem, a Christian writer of that period would not seek to emphasize. The passages referred to are the following: Servius ad G. 1, 466 constat autem occiso Caesare . . . solis fuisse defectum ab hora sexta usque ad noctem. Compare Matthew 27, 45; Mark 15, 33; Luke 23, 44 "and it was about the sixth hour and there was darkness over all the earth until the ninth hour." The remaining passages are from the Scholia of Daniel: 2, 801 Varro enim ait hanc stellam Luciferi, quae Veneris dicitur, ab Aenea, donec ad Laurentem agrum veniret, semper visam, et postquam pervenit, videri desiisse: unde et pervenisse se agnovit. Cf. Matt. 2, 9 "When they had heard the king, they departed; and, lo, the star, which they saw in the East, went before them, till it came and stood over where the young child was." The account of the deliverance of Peter, Acts 12, 7–10 "And his chains fell off from his hands . . . the gate which opened to them of his own accord," finds a counterpart in the comment ad 4, 469 iussit eum interim claudi vinctum; cumque sponte sua et carceris fores apertae essent, et vincula Acoeti excidissent; B. 6, 13 vinculis sponte labentibus.

II. *The Servius of Macrobius.*

The careful comparisons made by others of statements in Macrobius on passages in Vergil and comments on the same

Digitized by Google

passages in the Servius, show that statements in the one were not utilized in the preparation of the other. However, in some passages Macrobius has borrowed liberally from Gellius, and the statements in an abbreviated form appear in the scholia. Were these taken from Gellius or from Macrobius? If from the latter, the scholiast may have considered them as the work of Servius the commentator. In the comment on *vexare*, B. 6, 76, the scholiast has *huc atque illuc*, as has Gellius 2, 6, 5, while Macrobius has *huc et illuc* 6, 7, 8. Ad 10, 314, commenting on *squalentem*, D. has *crebritate atque asperitate*; Gellius 2, 6, 20 and Macrobius Sat. 6, 7, 17 have *crebritate asperitateque.* Commenting on *matura* as applied to fruit—under cover of a quotation from Nigidius—D., G. 1, 260 says *poma, quae neque acerba sint neque putrida, matura dicuntur.* Gell. 10, 11, 3 *in pomis matura dicuntur, quae neque cruda et inmitia sunt neque caduca et decocta, sed tempore suo adulta maturataque.* The statement of Macrobius 6, 8, 9 differs only slightly from the latter. In none of these is the phraseology such as to indicate that the material in the commentary was necessarily derived from Macrobius, and the same is true with reference to other topics discussed in the commentary, and by Servius in Macrobius. Yet this fact does not prove that Macrobius may not have complimented the commentator by representing him as taking part, in his early years, in a discussion with the best of the men of his day. The Servius of Macrobius was a young man. Macr. Sat. 7, 11, 2 Et Disarius, "age Servi non solum adulescentium qui tibi aequaevi sunt, sed senum quoque omnium doctissime"; 10 "Servius his dictis venerabiliter adsensus obticuit." If Macrobius introduced Servius merely as a compliment, basing the propriety of his presentation on the value of his later work, the words assigned to Servius must express the views of Macrobius, formed to some extent perhaps from a reading of the commentary. And even if the parts were actually spoken by a young Servius, many a change in views may have taken place before the writing of the commentary, which is evidently the work of mature years. Looked at either way, either as a complimentary assignment of parts to the young Servius or as an actual expression of his views, divergence in views, variations in statement, and other differences in presentation can have little weight in the determination of the identity of the two.

Digitized by Google

III. *Servius as Lexicographer.*

In a few passages the remarks of Servius indicate that he did not have at his command the entire Latin vocabulary. This is noticeable in the following comments: 1, 293 "ambages et compages antiqui tantum dicebant . . . cŏmpaginis enim nemo penitus dicit." The argument for a single genitive form for *compages* and *compago* was not closely observed. The MS D adds to the above comment, quoting from Ovid *compagine*, which is used again by the scholia ad 4, 646. Tertullian has *compago*, gen. *compaginis*, in all cases in the sing., and in the nom. plural. (See also Lex.) Ad 2, 15 INSTAR nomen est indeclinabile, licet Probus instaris declinaverit, ut nectaris. et caret praepositione, sicut 'peregre,' quamvis Serenus lyricus 'ad instar' dixerit. Ad 12, 923 Serenus is again mentioned as using *ad instar*, "quod in idoneis non invenitur auctoribus." Several examples of *ad instar* are cited by Neue, I, p. 484, and there are at least eight occurrences of the expression in Tertullian. Ad G. 3, 124 Servius says "nec pinguedo nec pinguetudo Latinum est." *Pinguedo*, however, is quoted from Varro by D. ad G. 4, 431, and by Macrobius Sat. 3, 15, 8, and is used by him 7, 13, 24 and 27. It is an addition of R to the comment ad B. 3, 5; is found Don. ad Ter. Eun. 2, 3, 26; Augustine C. D. 22, 12; Schol. to Persius 2, 63. (See also Lex.) The occurrence of these words, as well as *ac per hoc*, which is used by Tertullian, and by Augustine in C. D. more than one hundred times, may indicate that the writer of the Scholia of Daniel may have known these forms of expression, common to representative Christian writers, but which were not familiar to Servius.

IV. *Textual Readings.*

In the text of the Servius there is an occasional passage in which the reading is uncertain. Some of these can be satisfactorily corrected by substituting a common reading for the one given in the MSS; in others a slight transposition, insertion or deletion of letters or short words is necessary; in others, correction can come only through conjecture. This is especially true in the case of proper names, with which, except in a few instances, we have not attempted to deal. Most of the passages considered are from the Scholia of Daniel, and the ones from S. will be indicated. The following readings suggested, and in some instances accepted from others, have been to some extent based

Digitized by Google

on other passages in the commentaries. References are given to the line of Vergil, and in the longer comments also to the page and line of the Thilo-Hagen edition.

Book I.—6 (12, 7). The reading *quod non ab aliis* more closely resembles *quoniam aliis* than do the other suggested readings, and in meaning coincides with the words of S. ad 8, 314 indigenae id est inde geniti *αὐτόχθονες*.—8 (14, 14). The statement *!et hic* MUSA *non addidit μῆνιν ἄειδε θεά, sed* . . . is without meaning, though the intention seems to be to call out the contrast between direct singing by the muse, and by Vergil under the inspiration of the muse, and this contrast is shown by taking 'MUSA' as indirect object of *addidit*, and supplying *ut Homerus*.—25. The reading here, CAUSAE IRARUM *nonnulli tamen !pro causa et dolore accipiunt*, seems to have arisen from taking *pro* as governing the words individually instead of the entire expression '*causa et dolor*.' This use of *pro* is common, e. g. 3, 591 *pro* '*ignotus vir*'; 4, 390 *pro* '*deficiens*'; 5, 107 *pro* '*ipsi laeti*.'—248. *ipsum vero quidam dicunt !haec ora se appellasse* follows a comment of S. containing Antenoridae, and for this reason *Antenoridas* is not admissible, unless, as in some other places, the scholiast under *quidam dicunt* presents the views of Servius. If Antenor was like Aeneas in his love for Troy (cf. 1, 5; *3, 349*; 7, 158; 9, 641) *hos Troas* will answer. *Filium*, 305, is meaningless, while *peritus*, though not closely resembling it in form, is a common epithet, e. g. *3, 607; 5, 7; 8, 552*.—311. For *!curvis adlata navibus non*, we suggest *curata, occultis omnibus navibus*; and ad 329 *ad urbium custodiam* for *ad !uberum custodiam*. Cf. S. ad 6, 78 idem enim est Apollo, qui liber pater, qui sol; 4, 58 numinibus quae urbi praesunt. Ad 458 the scholiast says *et ambobus pro utrisque †arte hunc*. As *unius partis* precedes, and 8, 142 *utrorum* is used to explain *amborum, utrisque partibus* may be correct. Cf. 11, 592; *762*. The comment 479 *et mire in pictura !temporali adverbio quamvis non possit*, has probably lost *utitur* after *pictura*. *Qui . . . quique* is occasionally found, e. g. 1, 292 (108, 16); G. 1, 218 (183, 12), and so far justifies the reading *quique his eam regionem* for *quamque his regionem* 533. Ad 595 *solent videri . . . conspicere*, the force of *solent* has evidently been extended to *conspicere*, but the original may have been *videri si . . . conspiciantur*.

Book II.—22. *Evertere* is frequently used, e. g. *2, 602*; 2, 624; *8, 157*; 10, 91; 92, and the reading *quae eversa a Graecis est*

Digitized by Google

somewhat resembles *qui !et ipsa Graecis est.* Ad 143 the scholiast gives the derivation of *intemerata, de libris sacris commutatis litteris esse praesumptum, !timaram enim fidem, id est sanctam appellabant. Merito* for *mereo* seems to have been an early formation, and the participle of its negative *inmeritata*, with one change of *I* to *e*, will give *intemerata. Aut* for *et* seems required 210, *suffecti oculi et suffusos oculos habentes*, which combines the explanation by the nominative as in S., SUFFECTI pro infecti, and the not infrequent acc. with *habere.* Ad 299 a quotation by S. seems to have been lost and *ut ait* changed to *ut est.* The statement 482 auxit tapinosin †*in dicendo 'lato ore,'* seems a case of dittography, as *dicendo* is freely used, *dicens* occasionally taking its place, e. g. 2, 46 *adfectavit tapinosin dicens 'ligno.'* Ad 489 *confusae, sine consilio* seems the best reading for *confusio, consilio.* Cf. 3, 452 ignari, sine consilio; 4, 300 sine animo, sine consilio. The quotation from Sallust, 564 *!com Sertorios neque rumperet an levi copiam avibus*, is incomplete, though sufficient for the purpose of the scholiast, and needs a slight redistribution of letters, *quom Sertorius neque erumpere tam levi copia navibus.* Ad 2, 610 S. says notandum quod deos facit opera sua evertere, and this will sufficiently fortify the reading *adhuc opera sua non evertant* 599, for *adhuc sua opera !sua non avertant.* In the same way *se luctu conficeret* G. 1, 33, supports *luctu* for *!ad luchi* 626, while *ut si quis suadeat* 4, 47, decides the reading 638. Ad 693 (320, 8) there seems to have been a displacement of *pro*, and change of case in *auspicio* in the comment *quod de Ascanii !pro capite auspicii se obtulit.*

Book III.—The comment ad v. 133 (367, 22) *ex qua ortus eodem nomine Aeneas*, establishes *Aenean* as the proper word ad 80 (354, 2) *edidisse filium nomine !an.*—133. For †*ibique putant* read *plerique p.*, a common statement when *alii dicunt* precedes, as here. Various corrections have been offered for PORTENDERE *!significari debito* 184. It seems best to reconstruct from other comments and read *significare, deberi.* S. adds minus 'deberi,' and says 7, 256 PORTENDI praedici, significari; 3, 501 (429, 5) regna deberi. In the comment (207) REMIS INSURGIMUS *!cum remes, anaremos, id est exsurgentes fortius remigamus*, oars and endings have become mixed, and this is perhaps 'unum de insolubilibus,' though *incumbimus remis* (Verg. 5, 15; 10, 294) probably forms part of the comment, and perhaps *agimus remos*,

Digitized by Google

as *remus agitur* is used elsewhere in the commentaries, e. g. *4, 583*. The casual and the fatal are contrasted 265 (388, 4) *aut certe ideo 'casum'* !*ne si fatales averti non possit.* A similar statement occurs in S. 7, 120 DEBITA bona periphrasis est ne 'fatalis' diceret. Ad 274 (389, 5) *ut Sappho* †*quae his inde desiluit*, for *his inde* read *exinde*, which occurs rather commonly, e. g. *2, 166*; 6, 136; 7, 800; 8, 315; *8, 365*; G. 2, 161. *Identidem* 279 (391, 2) will give a satisfactory meaning in the comment *cum se* !*in dies inditum ungueret.* Ad 303 *non dixit cuius, sed exin* !*latinis intellegitur*, read *ex inlatis.* Though the participle does not seem to be used as a noun elsewhere in the commentaries, other forms of *inferre* are quite freely used to introduce both direct and indirect quotations, e. g. *2, 244*; 8, 172; *12, 136. Antique additae* resembles !*aut quia datae* 305. S. ad 2, 415; 2, 500 defines gemini, proprie simul nati, and ad 1, 313 calls attention to the archaic use of *bina* for *duo*, which would warrant a like comment by D. on *geminas.*—349. A negative has fallen from the text, or perhaps *devitavisse* has been distributed in the comment *multi putant Aenean* !*de ea* (or *et*) *venisse ad Epirum.* The comment of S. ad 475 seems correct, Graecus est ergo de quo valde apud !eos quaeritur, the plural *eos* referring to Graecus as elsewhere, e. g. 11, 383 est de Graeco: nam ita dicunt; 12, 7; B. 10, 19; G. 2, 98; 1, 207 graece . . . dicunt. S. ad 553 connects Caulon mentioned by Vergil with Mt. Aulon, on whose summit there was a city !olim non est, evidently for Caulon nominatus est. The apparent irregularity ad 681, in !inmane autem quod ait, is removed by inserting *est*, as G. 1, 47 inmane est quod ait. Ad 689 the reading of Schoell, παντηχήεις, gives the Greek equivalent of the explanation of Servius for Pantagia *quasi pantacuos* dictus est, quasi ubique sonans. This, however, is too far from the form in the text. The transfer in meaning from 'all hearing' to 'everywhere echoing' is possible, and παντάκουσα or παντακύας (Nager) closely resembles the words of the comment.

Book IV.—50. For !*et alii quod te* read *et alibi quod ait*, and cf. 2, 793; *4, 137*; 5, 626 quod in primo ait. Ad 77 !*retulit pervigratum est* may be for *se retulit. Pervigilatum est.* In the comment 108 *quod autem addidit* !*satis bello exserte*, supply *docet* and read *q. a. a.* '*bello*' *docet satis expertam.* For †*Mercurius* 243 (508, 9) we suggest *cum secure*, and for †*adhic* 271

Digitized by Google

(515, 7), *et hic*, which is freely used in the comments. 367 *nec tigres iuxta †dum cognitae* may be changed to *n. t. i. sunt cognitae*, and *pondera iures* 476, to *ponderari res.* Ad 620 *extanguinem dicunt repertum, extanguinem* seems like a combination of *extinctum* and *exsanguem.* We suggest *dicunt extinctum nec repertum*, and ad 681 *illam crudelem dicit, quamvis sit dubium 'tu an ego.'*

Book V.—117 *genus †italu Memmi* seems modelled after the statement of Vergil Italus Mnestheus, which would favor the reading *genus Itali Memmi.* In the same way ad 179, commenting on 'at gravis . . . madidaque fluens in veste,' D. uses a part of the words of V., *et ideo 'gravis' madida.* Read *et ideo 'gravis' quia 'madida in veste.'* Ad 1, 3 (9, 25) the statement is made *amissus Palinurus et Misenus*, which will support the reading 840 *in undas cecidisse constat et amissum.*

Book VI.—Ad 279, commenting on the catalogue of evils given by Vergil, D. has *mire ! cum omnia in vestibulo, bellum vero in limine ipso posuit.* From Vergil's description we may read *mire letum Orci in vestibulo.*—871. The comment of S., nam ! felicitas vestra sunt munera, may be amended by reading *infelicia* for *felicitas.*

Book VII.—188. Among the *pignora* of the Roman Empire is mentioned ! *aius matris deum.* No satisfactory word resembling this in form has been suggested, and *currus* might as well be read. Cf. Verg. 3, 113; 6, 785; and Munro ad Lucr. 2, 600 seqq.

Book VIII.—Ad 67 *et cito* is meaningless; perhaps for *in tertio* misplaced. Ad 144 change gender of terms and read 'geminum est praeteritum.' Ad 429 (265, 6) *fulmen trisulcum est: aut enim terebrat aut incendit aut †disclina*, three verbs evidently have been used to explain *trisulcum.* For last verb read *diffindit*, and cf. 2, 649 tria sunt fulminum genera. est quod efflat, quod incendit, quod findit. A wonder in the clear sky justifies *in eo est omen quod 'aperto,'* ad 523.

Book IX.—8. For *tutam* read *Troia*, and cf. supra, ad 1, 248. Ad 289 *non a participio †futura cum Terentius, futura* may represent an original *utitur,—non participio utitur: ut Terentius.* Ad 606 *sit ita* may be for *sic ait.*

Digitized by Google

Book X.—Ad 25 *excessus* may be for *excesserat*, and 76 *veniam det* !*negentibus* for *v. d. rogantibus*. Cf. Verg. 11, 101 veniamque rogantes. Ad 272 (423, 3) †*ple vel inpleniores* may have been formed by a redistribution of *plures in Plinio*, the *-res* of *plures* forming a new comparative from *in Plinio*. In the comment 497 (443, 2) *multis saepe advotus contumeliis*, one modifier is superfluous, and may be disposed of by reading *multis permotus contumeliis*. The statement 705 PARIN CREAT *plus est, quam si diceret 'face praegnas,' incendit paret*, indicates that the scholiast noticed the evidently unnatural conclusion 'face praegnas Parin creat,' though admitting that it is more forcible than the natural outcome *incendia parit*.

Book XI.—202. *Facit* may be read for *pater*, and 826 *cogitaret* may be supplied. The scholiast ad 11, 239 states: *Diomedem Aetolum dicit, quia pater eius Tydeus Aetolus fuit*. Guided by this, we may read ad 308 *a patre eius Tydeo ideo Diomedis mentionem intulit*, instead of *a patri usque adde in D. m. i.* Ad 879 *potanda elocutio* is evidently for *notanda e.* Cf. 1, 75 notanda figura; 135 n. sermo; 561 n. breviloquium; 3, 72 n. varietas.

ILLINOIS WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON, ILL. R. B. STEELE.

Digitized by Google

V.—ETYMOLOGICAL MISCELLANY.

1.—Lat. *crāpula* 'excessive wine-drinking, drunkenness,' from which *crāpulārius*, *crāpulātus*, etc., may be compared with OChSl. *kropiti* 'sprinkle, drip, besprinkle,' Lith. *krāpinu* 'besprinkle.' The primary meaning of Lat. *crāpula* was, therefore, 'wetting, drenching,' and the further development the same as in Lat. *madeo*, *madidus*, etc.

2.—Lat. *forma* is easily derivable from the root *bher-* 'bear, bring together, hold.' Primarily the word would mean 'holder, container,' and hence 'frame, case, enclosure,' then 'mould, model, last,' and finally 'form, shape' in general. The word in that case is nearest related to Goth. *barms* 'bosom,' OHG., MHG. *barm* 'lap, bosom,' OE. *bearm* 'bosom, lap; middle, inside; possession,' ON. *barmr* 'bosom, breast; edge, rim, brim,' Gk. φορμός 'basket, mat, bundle of wood.'

Or we may start from the primary meaning 'edge, brim' as in ON. *barmr* 'edge, rim, brim,' MHG. *brem* 'verbrämung, rand, einfassung,' *bremen* 'verbrämen,' NHG. *brame*, *bräme* 'brim, edge, border,' OE. *brymme* 'border, shore,' E. *brim*. This naturally gives 'frame, case, enclosure' with the further development as above.

3.—Lat. *jūbilum* 'wild cry, shout,' *jūbilō* 'shout' may be referred to a stem **ǰoudhelo-* 'moving violently, shaking, excited' and derived from the root *ǰeudh-* in Lith. *jùdinu* 'move, stir, shake,' *judù* 'tremble, stir,' *jundù* 'flutter, stir,' *jundulas* 'uproar, tumult,' *jùdra* 'whirlwind,' *jaudrinu* 'stir up, incite,' Skt. *júdhyati* 'fight,' Lat. *juba* 'mane,' etc. (cf. Uhlenbeck, Ai. Wb., for other related words).

4.—Lat. *lūror* 'yellowish color, sallowness, paleness,' *lūridus* 'pale yellow, sallow, wan, ghastly' may be referred to a base *loiro-*. In that case compare Gk. λειρός 'thin, pale, sallow.' These are from the root *lei-* 'withdraw, shrink, dwindle, fade away' in Skt. *līyatē*, *lāyatē* 'disappear, withdraw, shrink, slink,' etc. (cf. Prellwitz, Et. Wb., s. v. λειρός), and are closely related to Lith. *leilas* 'thin, slender'; *leinas*, *lainas* 'slim, slender,' ON. *linr* 'weak,' etc.; Lith. *lëšas* 'thin, lean,' OChSl. *lichŭ* 'poor, bad'; Lith.

Digitized by Google

lâibas 'slender,' OChSl. *libivŭ* 'gracilis'; Alb. *l'ik* 'lean, bad,' Lith. *ligà* 'sickness,' Gk. λοιγός 'destruction, death'; Gk. λτμός 'hunger,' λοιμός 'pest,' and probably also Lat. *līmus* 'sidelong,' i. e. 'withdrawing, turning'; Gk. λοιτός· λοιμός (Hes.), OHG. *leid* 'grievous, hateful'; Goth. *leitils*, ON. *lîtill* 'small, little,' Lith. *lëidmi*, *lëidžu* 'let go,' *laidinù* 'let run,' etc. (cf. Persson, Wz. 15).

5.—Lat. *ob-līviō*, *ob-līvium* doubtless belong to the same root. Primarily, therefore, they meant 'a slipping away, disappearance.' From this, as above, developed 'faded,' the original signification in Lat. *līveō* 'be bluish,' *līvens*, *līvidus* 'bluish, leaden, livid,' *līvor* 'bluish color,' with which have been compared Ir. *li*, Welsh *lliw* 'color,' etc. (cf. Fick, Wb. II⁴ 251).

6.—With Lat. *nimbus* 'rainstorm, raincloud' compare OE. *ge-nip* 'mist, cloud, darkness,' *nīpan* 'grow dark,' Goth. *ganipnan* 'become sad,' i. e. 'gloomy.' These are from a base *nei-bo-*, *ni-bo-*, which may be compared with *nei-g̑ʷo-* in Gk. νίζω, νίπτω 'wash,' χέρ-νιψ 'holy water for the hands,' Skt. *nênēkti* 'wash, purify,' *niktá-s* 'washed, purified,' Ir. *necht* 'pure,' *nigther* 'lavatur,' OE. *nicor* 'water-monster,' etc. (cf. Fick, Wb. II⁴ 194); with *nei-gho-* in Skt. *nihā-kā*, *nīhā-rá-s* 'mist,' and perhaps Lat. *niger* 'dark, black'; with *nei-do-* in Skt. *nêdati* 'flow, stream'; with *nei-ro-* in Skt. *nīra-m* 'water.' From these words we are certainly justified in assuming a base *nĭ-* 'flow, rain.'

7.—Gk. ζόφος 'gloom, darkness,' probably from **ĝʰobho-s*, whence ζόφιος, ζοφερός 'gloomy, dusky,' may be compared with Lith. *žibù* 'gleam, glimmer,' *žiburỹs* 'light, torch,' *žaĩbas* 'lightning,' *žëbiù* 'see dimly,' etc. The change in meaning is the same as in OE. *glōwan* 'glow' : *glōm* 'gloom, twilight'; *scīma* 'light' : *scima* 'shadow, gloom,' etc. To the above group probably belongs also Gk. ζέφυρος 'west-wind.' Compare Lith. *žiburiúju* 'flicker.'

8.—Gk. κλοιός 'collar, dog-collar' is probably from **qlosio-s*, as explained by Hirt, Idg. Abl. 617, and a derivative of IE. **qoloso-* 'neck,' Lat. *collum*, Goth. *hals*, etc. Compare especially ON. *hels* 'necklace,' pre-Germ. **qolsio-*.

9.—Gk. κύκνος 'swan' was doubtless named from its white color. Compare Skt. *çôcati* 'gleam, glow,' *çuci-ṣ* 'shining, bright, white.' So also Lat. *albus* 'white' : OHG. *elbiz* 'swan.'

10.—Gk. μάργος 'raging, mad; greedy; lustful,' μαργάω, μαργαίνω 'rage,' μεργίζω· ἀθρόως ἐσθίειν (Hes.), etc., may be compared with Skt. *mṛgá-s* 'wild animal, gazelle, bird,' *mṛgáyatē* 'chase, pursue,

Digitized by Google

hunt, seek for,' *mṛgyáti* 'chase, seek,' Av. *mərəγaiti* 'wander about.' The primary meaning here was 'move rapidly, wander.' We may therefore compare further Russ. *morgátĭ* 'blink,' Lith. *mìrgu* 'flicker,' *márgas* 'gay-colored.' These last are also given by Uhlenbeck, Ai. Wb., s. v. *mṛgás*, but with a different explanation. The change of meaning 'move rapidly' : 'flicker, sparkle' is a very common one. Compare Gk. *αἰόλος* 'quickly moving' : 'glittering'; Lat. *coruscus* 'waving' : 'glittering'; *vĭbrō* 'brandish' : 'glitter'; Skt. *tviṣiṣ* 'violence' : 'splendor'; and many others.

11.—Gk. *σίνομαι* 'hurt, damage, waste, plunder,' Aeol. *σίννομαι* <**tųinįomai*, *σίνος* 'hurt, mischief, plague,' *σίνις*, *σιντής* 'robber,' *σιναρός* 'hurtful; hurt, damaged,' etc., are from a base **tųĭ-no-* 'dwindle, waste away' in OE. *þwīnan* 'dwindle, fall away.' From the root *tųĭ-* come also OE. *þwītan* 'cut, shave off,' *ā-þwītan* 'disappoint, frustrari,' pre-Germ. **tųei-do-* 'cause to come off.' This root *tųĭ-* we may regard as an outgrowth of *tu-* 'swell, flow, flow away' in OE. *þāwian*, OHG. *douwen* 'thaw,' *donēn* 'swell,' Lith. *tvānas* 'flood,' etc. This enlarged base occurs in Skt. *tôya-m* 'water.' For meaning compare Skt. *kṣárati* 'flow, glide, vanish' : Gk. *φθείρω* 'corrupt, spoil, ruin'; Gk. *ἀλαπάζω* 'empty, drain' : 'waste, slay'; OE. *gēotan* 'flow, pour, shed' : *gītan* 'destroy,' Lith. *žudaũ* 'slay, kill' (cf. author, Mod. Lang. Notes, XV 96).

12.—A similar development of meaning occurs in derivatives of the root *tĭ-* 'melt, waste away' : OE. *þīnan* 'become moist,' *þān* 'moist, irrigated' (land), *þānian* 'be or become moist,' *þēnan* 'moisten,' ON. *þiðr* 'melted, thawed, soft,' *þíða* 'melt, thaw out, soften,' OChSl. *tina* 'mud, slime,' Ir. *tinaid* 'disappear, vanish' : Gk. *τινάσσω* 'shake, swing, scatter,' Skt. *tinōti* 'crush,' Lith. *tinù*, *tìnti* 'dengeln.'

Similarly may be connected Gk. *τῖλος*, *τίλημα* 'thin stool, diarrhoea, *τιλάω* 'have thin stool,' Welsh *tail* 'stercus, fimus' (Fick, Wb. II⁴ 121) : Gk. *τῖλος* 'anything pulled or shredded, flock, down,' *τῖλαι* 'flocks, motes,' *τίλλω* 'pluck, pull off, tear,' Skt. *tilá-s* 'particle, grain, sesame,' *tilaka-s* 'mole, beauty-spot, ornament,' *tilakayati* 'mark, adorn.' Compare Lat. *scindō* 'cut, tear, split,' Lith. *skëdžiu* 'part, separate; make thin, dilute,' *skýstas* 'dünnflüssig,' Germ. *skītan* 'cacare,' primarily 'flow thin.'

The root *tĭ-* from which the above words come may be from a base *tă-io-*, *tăi-*, a derivative of *tă-* in OChSl. *tajati* 'sich auflösen, schmelzen, vergehen,' Ir. *tám* 'tabes,' Welsh *tawdd* 'liquefactio,'

Digitized by Google

base **tājo-s*, Lat. *tā-bes* 'a wasting away, dwindling, melting,' *tābeō*, etc., Gk. τήκω, τᾶκω 'melt, smelt,' τακερός 'molten, flowing, fluid.' It is also possible that the base *tu̯ĭ-* 'dwindle, waste away' may be the schwundstufe of *tāu-io-* (in which case Skt. *tôya-m* is from **tau-i̯o-m*), a derivative of *tă-u̯o-* from *tă-*. So Skt. *tôyam*, OHG. *douwen*, etc., are explained by Uhlenbeck, Ai. Wb., s. v. *tôyam*. Cf. also Fick, Wb. II⁴ 120 f. However, it is quite as possible that *tā-* 'waste away, dwindle, melt'; *tī-* 'waste away, melt, crumble, crush, scatter'; and *tu̯ī-* 'dwindle, waste away, shave off, waste, plunder' are entirely distinct.

13.—Gk. σμίλη 'knife, chisel' is referred to a root *smĭ-* 'cut' in Gk. σμινύη 'hoe,' OHG. *smid* 'smith,' etc. The same root with an *-l*-suffix occurs in Lith. *smailùs* 'sharp, keen, bold, greedy,' *smaĩlinu* 'sharpen,' *smailáuju*, *smiláuju* 'nibble, eat daintily,' etc.

14.—Gk. σπεύδω 'urge on, press on, promote, hasten,' σπουδή 'haste, speed, zeal, trouble' evidently come from some such meaning as 'press, thrust.' We may therefore compare Lith. *spaudà* 'press' (which corresponds exactly with Gk. σπουδή, primarily 'pressure, urgency'), *spáudẽiu* 'press, squeeze,' *spāudau* 'press repeatedly.' The Gk. words have been connected also with OHG. *spioz* 'spiess,' ON. *spīōt* 'spear,' Norw. dial. *føysa*, Sw. *fösa* 'drive, chase,' dial. *fös* 'haste' (cf. Lidén, PBB. XV 521; Noreen, Urg. Lautlehre, 192; Tamm, Et. Ordb., s. v. *fösa*). In Germ. the word also took on the figurative meaning 'mock, jeer' in ON. *spott*, OHG. *spot* 'spott,' *spotton*, ON. *spotta* 'spotten,' pre-Germ. base **spud-no-*.

15.—Gk. ὕμνος 'song, hymn of praise' is perhaps from **su-mno-s* 'well-minded, speaking well of' and cognate with Skt. *sumná-* 'well-disposed,' *sumná-m* 'favor, devotion, prayer, song.'

16.—Gk. ὕλη 'wood, forest, substance' is perhaps from **sūlā-*, in which case compare OHG. *sūl*, OE. *sȳl*, ON. *súla* 'pillar,' OHG. *swelli* 'schwelle,' OE. *syll* 'sill, foundation,' Goth. *ga-suljan* 'found' (cf. Kluge, Et. Wb., s. v. *Schwelle*).

17.—Gk. ὑλίζω 'cleanse, clear, strain, filter' I derive from the base *sṷe-l-* 'swell, flow.' Compare Skt. *súrā*, Av. *hura* 'brandy,' Lith. *sulà* 'birch sap,' Lett. *sula* 'sap,' OE., OHG. *sol* 'filthy pool, mire,' *solōn* 'become filthy,' OE. *be-sylian* 'bespatter, soil,' Goth. *bi-sauljan* 'soil, sully,' OE. *swillan* 'wash,' *swellan* 'swell,' etc. (cf. Persson, Wz. 175).

18.—Skt. *klídyati* 'become moist,' *klēdayati* 'moisten,' *klēda-s* 'moisture': Lith. *sklìdinas* 'overflowing,' *sklį̃stù* 'be fluid, flow.'

Digitized by Google

19.—Skt. *klībá-s* 'cowardly, weak' : Lith. *klibù* 'totter, wiggle,' *klibinu* 'loosen, wackelig machen.' These seem to be from a root or base *qlī-* 'sway, turn aside.' Compare Lith. *klairu* 'wiggle, become loose'; *klajùs* 'leading astray'; *klaidùs* 'causing error,' *klaidinù* 'lead astray'; *kleipiù* 'turn over one's shoes,' *klaipaũ* 'schuhwerk fortgesetzt schieftreten,' *klypstù* 'beim treten die füsse seitlich krumm biegen'; *klìszas* 'schiefbeinig,' *kleiszũju* 'run along with turned-in feet.' Compare *k̂lī-* in Lith. *szlajùs* 'schief, schräg,' *szleivas* 'krummbeinig,' *szlëjù* 'lehne an,' Gk. κλίνω, etc. But *qlī-* and *k̂lī-* are probably not related. If meaning only decided, then we might equally as well compare Lith. *kreĩvas* 'gewunden, schief,' *kreipiù* 'wenden, kehren,' etc.

20.—Skt. *bhrḗṣa-s* 'a swaying, stumbling, fall,' *bhrḗṣati* 'sway, totter' are, according to Uhlenbeck, Ai. Wb., not explained. These are certainly reducible to the root *bhrī-* 'move violently, be agitated' in Gk. φριμάω, φριμάσσομαι 'leap and snort, jump about, be wanton,' ON. *brīme* 'fire' (cf. Persson, Wz. 104).

21.—Skt. *çarát* 'autumn, year,' Av. *sarəδō*, NPers. *sāl* 'year,' Osset. *särdä*, *särd* 'summer' are connected by Uhlenbeck, Ai. Wb., with Skt. *çíçiras* 'cool, cold.' They are rather to be connected with Lith. *szilus* 'August,' *szìlti* 'become warm,' Lat. *caleō* 'be warm,' *calidus* 'warm, hot.'

FRANCIS A. WOOD.

Digitized by Google

VI.—SOME LUCRETIAN EMENDATIONS.

V 989:

> Nec nimio tum plus quam nunc mortalia saecla
> dulcia linquebant lamentis lumina vitae.

OQ *lamentis*, Brieger, Bailey. *labentis* Muretus, Lambinus, Lachmann, Bernays, Munro. *lăbantis* Giussani.

Read *clamantis*. For the nom. pl. in *-is* cf. *animalis*, I 808, *visentis*, II 577, and Lachmann's commentary, p. 56. There are 14 accepted cases in Lucretius. For the construction according to sense, *saecla . . . clamantis*, cf. the MS reading (retained by Giussani and Holtze), I 188 sq. omnia quando | paulatim crescunt, ut par est, semine certo | crescentesque genus servant; I 56 unde omnis natura creet res auctet alatque | quove eadem rursum natura perempta resolvat; VI 214 cum rarescunt quoque nubila caeli. | nam cum ventus eas; VI 185 nubibus . . . lata . . . exstructa; I 351 arbusta . . . totas; VI 757 quadrupedes . . . mactata. Lucretius does not happen to use *clamare*, but *clamor* occurs at least a dozen times: IV 1014 tollunt clamorem quasi si iugulentur ibidem; IV 1016 et quasi pantherae morsu saevive leonis | mandantur, magnis clamoribus omnia complent. *Clamantia*, to agree with *saecla*, would have been out of place with *lumina*. Note that immediately follows unus enim tum quisque magis deprensus eorum | pabula viva feris praebebat, dentibus haustus, | et nemora ac montis gemitu silvasque replebat | viva videns vivo sepeliri viscera busto. *Linquebat lamentis* is dubious Latin; *labentis vitae* suggests a peaceful, and not the violent death which is postulated by *enim* in 990, even if people starved to death in 1007.

III 453:

> claudicat ingenium delirat lingua mens.

So OQ, but Q corr. *lingua madet mens*, as in 479. *lingua mensque*, Itali. *labat mens*, editors, except Brieger, who has *lingua †mens.*

Madet is unsuitable to express decay of faculties in old age. A verb beginning with *m* to alliterate with *mens* is needed. Alliteration of the two closing words of the verse is very common in L.

Digitized by Google

Write *meat.* The word is so much like *mens* that it would easily fall out. *Meo* occurs over 15 times in the poem. Or *migrat*: V 831 omnia migrant; Plaut. Trin. 639 neque mens officio migrat. Lachmann's *labat* is excellent, but why did it fall out? *Meat* is more probable: animus errat III 463; videtur | ire anima III 593; meare spiritus coeperat, Curtius, III 5. 9.

IV 418:

nubila despicere et caelum ut videare videre
corpora mirande sub terras abdita caelo.

So O; *et* for *ut* Q. Lachm. omits *ut*, interchanges the order of 418–19, and writes *ut prope miraclo . . . caeli.* Munro and Bailey regard *caelum* as corrupt. Brieger, *solem ut*, with lacuna following the verse. *Despicere* is retained by Br. and Giussani, and *dispicere* is read by Lachm., Bernays, Munro, Bailey. *Caeli ut* by Bergk, Polle, Giuss. *Videre ut*, Bern. Munro proposed for *caelum* either *volucrum* or *atque avium.* There are several other attempts at emendation. In 419 Munro reads *corpora mirando . . . caelo.* Br. (now), *corpora mirande . . . caeli*; *corpora mirande . . . caelo* is retained by Wakefield, Giuss. and Bailey, the last of whom regards *mirande* as corrupt. *Corpora miraclo . . . caeli*, Bern. Write

nubila despicere et caeli ut videare videre
caerula mirande sub terras abdita caelo.

The connection of thought is the reflection of the sky in a pool of water. I propose *caerula* for *corpora*: I 1090 per caeli caerula, from Ennius, Ann. 50. Polle, I find, has also proposed *caerula*, but he would have *ludo* for *caelo. Mirande* 'in wondrous wise' recurs again in 462, where it is retained by Havercamp, Wakefield, Bockemüller, Giuss. and Bailey, and lately by Brieger. The reading of O, *caelum ut*, is due to careless repetition of the *u* vowel. The other words have been defended by the scholars who advocate them.

III 962:

aequo animoque agendum magnis concede necessest

Magnis OQ, *iam aliis* Marullus, *magnus* censor Orellii and Munro, *dignis* Lachm., *ad manis* Bock., *gnatis* Bern., Br., Giuss., *manus* Everett, *gnavis* Brandt, Woltjer, *Maccus* Bury, *gnavus* Nencini, †*magnis* Heinze, Bailey. *Humanis* was read by Munro in his edition of 1860: IV 1191 humanis concedere rebus, and I wonder that he abandoned it. Could *monitus* 'you have your

Digitized by Google

warning' be right? All the editors change *agendum* to *agedum*. In this locus desperatus it is possible that the corruption lies in *agendum*. Starting from *-ndum*, I propose:

(1) aequo animoque age: iam dormis: concede: necessest.

Iam dormis 'you are already in the sleep of death'; marces 956, mors ad caput adstitit 959, ad somnum si res redit 910.

(2) With more confidence:

aequo animoque age: numne gemis? concede: necessest.

Numne gemis is not so far from *nedummagnis*, and all do not share Ritschl's doubt of the Latinity of *numne*. *Gemere* is a Lucretian word: V 1348, III 297; *congemis* 934, in this very connection, and *lamentetur* 952. I regret that Lucr. does not use *numne*, but III 973 numquid ibi horribile apparet, num triste videtur | quicquam.

V 703:

qui faciunt solem certa desurgere parte.

Write *de surgere*. *Desurgere* occurs nowhere else in L., but *surgere* 8 times. IV 1133 de . . . surgit; VI 819 de . . . surgit; VI 1101 de . . . surgunt; VI 467 de . . . surgere; VI 477 surgere de. IV 344 de speculi qua parte recedas; VI 99 caeli de parte serena; VI 522 omni . . . de parte feruntur. It is well known that prepositions had not become closely welded to verbs in Lucretius' time; surely this extremely rare word *desurgere*, occurring elsewhere only in one passage of Horace (S. 2. 2. 77) among classical writers, should not be needlessly fastened on Lucretius. After arriving at this conclusion, I have found that Lambinus separated the compound.

VI 29:

quidve mali foret in rebus mortalibu' passim.

Write *quidque*. The connection of thought demands a copulative conjunction. The use of *ve* for *que* in Lucretius is well known in *quove* for the ambiguous *quoque*; so III 34, V 71. I 57, V 776. V 184 *quove*, but V 185 *quidque*. But *quaeque* for *et quae* II 1031, II 64. *Quareve* VI 533, IV 634 because *quareque* would have been ambiguous. Seneca, Ep. 95. 11 quotes I 57 with *quoque*. The MSS have *quoque* in IV 48, retained by editors since Munro. Verg. A. V 23, Sall. Jug. 30 have *quoque*; Verg. A. X 150 *quidve* twice. Apparently the usage of Lucretius is *quove* for *quoque*, *quareve* for *quareque*; but *quidque*, and not *quidve*. V 184–5 is decisive:

Digitized by Google

quove modost umquam vis cognita principiorum
quidque inter sese permutato ordine possent.

I 469:

namque aliud terris, aliud regionibus ipsis
eventum dici poterit quodcumque erit actum.

terris OQ. *saeclis* Bern., Br., Giuss., Ba. *Teucris* Munro. *per sest* Lachm. *rebus* Lamb. *Terris . . . legionibus* Wakef. Stürenberg rejects the verse. Br. infers a lacuna. Polle ejects both 469 and 470. Winckelmann and Everett keep the text. Bouterwek, *per se est . . . tempŏribus.* Bock. *terris . . . redigentibus. Terris* is sound; the corruption lies in *regionibus.* Write

(1) namque aliud terris, aliudque colentibus ipsis.

V 1441 colebatur tellus; V 1369 mansuescere terram | cernebant indulgendo blandeque colendo. The contrast is between the lands and their occupants, i. e. tillers.

Or (2) namque aliud terris aliudque cluentibus ipsis.

Clueo is one of his favorite archaisms, e. g. I 449—at the beginning of this paragraph—nam quaecumque cluent, and a few lines below, 480, nec ratione cluere eadem. *Cluentibus* supplies the place of the missing participle of *esse. Regionibus* is very near in form to *cluentibus*: the *gi* is a probable corruption of *cl*, while *saeclis* is far removed from *terris.* IV 52 *civet* OQ, *cluet* edd. *Ipsis* also well supports such a participle; translate: for one thing may be termed an accident of the lands and another of the persons (*ipsis*) who live there (*cluentibus*), whatever shall have occurred. This participle naturally passed out of use as the form was needed for the noun *cliens*: Pl. Men. 575 cluentum fides quoius modi clueat. Lucretius has *cluet, cluent, clueant, clueret, cluebit, cluere; cluebit* is not cited from any other author. *Habitantibus* would have expressed the thought and is metrically admissible: had he not been so fond of *cluere*, he would probably have used it.

I 555:

conceptum summum aetatis pervadere finis

summum . . . finis O, *fine* Q, *finem* Flor. 30 corr. *summa . . . finis* Lachm. *summum . . . ad auctum* Munro. *ad summum . . . finis* Br. *summum . . . fine* Ellis; *summam . . . ad horam* Everett. *summum florem* Lamb. *primum aetatis . . . limen* Lotze.

Read *floris.* III 770, V 847 aetatis tangere florem; I 564 aevi contingere florem; IV 1105 flore . . . aetatis. For the dependent

Digitized by Google

genitive *aetatis floris* cf. 557–8 diei | infinita aetas anteacti temporis. *Flos aetatis* is the period of maturity before decay, which so frequently begins with the downhill of life, sets in: hence *summum* is particularly suitable. Sen. de Ben. IV 6. 6 surgenti iuventae terminum ponens.

III 387:

qui nimia levitate cadunt plerumque gravatim.

No one has yet questioned the very rare word *gravatim*, used elsewhere only by Livy, I 2. 3 haud gravatim socia arma Rutulis iunxit, and Solinus, I 76 <Milo> taurum . . . solidum . . . absumpsit solus non gravatim—in both cases joined to a negative and predicated of persons. Here it refers to feathers and thistle-down which by reason of exceeding lightness fall—reluctantly? Who ever heard of a reluctant feather or of one falling unwillingly, grudgingly, wearily, burdensomely? Munro translates it 'not lightly'; Heinze, 'schwerer,' just as if *graviter* stood in the text, that being the favorite Lucretian adverb with *cado*. *Gravatim* is not a synonym of *graviter*, and if it were, the case would be even worse, for how can light things fall heavily? Ovid, Met. X 738 nimia levitate caducum, of a flower, is no defence, because in the next line *excutiunt venti* follows, and of course a flower slightly attached would be blown off and fall; Quint. XII 10. 73 casuris si leviter excutiantur flosculis.

Write *gradatim*. Lucretius likes to appeal to common experience. Feathers do fall by degrees, and also the winged seeds of plants. This gradual fall would cause the moment of contact to pass unnoticed. *Gradatim* is a very common word; Lucretius prefers *paulatim* and *tractim*, and does not use *sensim*. The rare occurrence of *gradatim* with *cadere* and other verbs of falling is natural: authors rarely have occasion to speak of a gradual fall. *Sensim*, *pedetemptim*, *tractim*, *paulatim* are rare—perhaps unexampled—with these verbs. At Rome things fell heavily, violently, unexpectedly; hence *gravatim* (as if = *graviter*) of the text, suggested by *cadunt*. *Levius casura pila* occurs in Caesar, B. C. III 92. 2.

W. A. MERRILL.

Digitized by Google

VII.—SOME CELTIC TRACES IN THE GLOSSES.

A. *Celtic Words Interpreted.*

Orge occide, C. G. L. V 376, 29 (Epinal) = ibid. V 316, 70 (Erfurt^2) = Corpus (ed. Hessels) O 238; Erfurt^1 (C. G. L. V 376, 29) has *orgę*.

Years ago I had conceived the idea that *orge* was connected with the *orgim* (caedo, occido) pointed out by Stokes in the Academy of 1891 (p. 589, col. I), and its derivative *orgiat* (caesar = caesor, i. e. qui caedit, interfector), *athir-oirc-nid* (parricida), *sethar-oirc-nid* (sororicida), quoted by Zeuss^2, p. 1054. But to get an authoritative opinion on the word, I wrote, in 1898, to Dr. Stokes, and here is what he was kind enough to tell me in confirmation: "*orgę*, *orge* 'occide' is certainly based on the Celtic root *org*, which Prof. Bezzenberger has connected with Zend *arezar* 'Schlacht.' *Orgĕ* may well have been a Gaulish 2d sg. imperative. See the neo-Celtic forms in Zeuss^2 443, *bir*, *mil*, *gaib*, from **bere*, **mele*, **gabe*." I am pleased to see that Dr. Stokes made use of the gloss pointed out by me to corroborate his explanation of O'Mulconry's *asurg* (caedo) as having sprung from **ex-orgô*. (See Archiv f. kelt. Lexik. I 280.) Further proof for the word is to be found in the compound *treorgam* (perforo), on record in the Luxembourg folio, p. 2, No. 37, and explained by Prof. Rhŷs (Rev. Celt. I 503) as composed of *tre* 'through' and *orgam* 'I cut.' Cp. also Nigra's *esartae* 'pro *es-arc-te* (caesus), nom. sg. part. praet. pass. uerbi *esurc*, *asurc* (caedo),' etc. (Gloss. Hib. Vet. Cod. Taur., ed. C. Nigra, Paris, 1869, p. 50).

The above *orge* would make it seem somewhat plausible that another strange gloss occurring only in the Epinal, Erfurt, and Corpus glossaries contains a Celtic word in its lemma. The gloss is *netcos murus* (Epinal); Erfurt-Corpus have *naetcos*. If one may venture a suggestion in so doubtful a case, *netcos* appears to stand for *nectcos*, and the interpretation would then seem to have been shortened and corrupted from *mun^{t}us* [*pes*]. As to *nect* (*mundus*) cf. *neacht .i. geal* (Lecan Glossary M. 90),

Digitized by Google

necht .i. glan (H. 3, 18, p. 637 a), quoted by Stokes in the Archiv f. kelt. Lexik. I 89. *Necht* is according to him = νιπτος in ἄνιπτος, Skr. *nikta*. In regard to *nechtcos* cp. *glanchosta* (gl. *merops*, translated as if it were *mero-pes*, i. e. *nudis pedibus*), Zeuss², p. 791. Goetz, Thes. Gloss. Emend., p. 724, proposes to read the lemma as τεῖχος. He also draws attention to C. Gl. L. III 500, 64 *neos murus*.

Just as uncertain as *netcos murus* is the gloss *cloes pluuia* which occurs in C. G. L. IV 45, 17; 216, 41; 500, 35; V 446, 32. 57; 521, 9; 542, 2; 564, 37; in V 494, 50 the lemma reads *chies*, and in V 593, 52 *uel nauigium* appears as alternative interpretation, probably arising from confusion of *cloes* with *celox*. Can *cloes* stand for *clo es[t]*? *Clo* I would connect with O'Mulconry's *clō .i. gaoth* and the *clo .i. gaithe* (gl. *turbo*) quoted by Stokes, Archiv f. kelt. Lexik. I 287. *Clό* Stokes is inclined to connect with OE. *hlόwan*, ON. *hlόa* 'to roar.' With *clό* cp. the Bas-Léon *an glao* 'la pluie,' cited from Gregoire de Rostrenen, Grammaire françoise celtique (a. 1738), p. 28, in Rev. Celt. II 116; cf. also *bannech glau g. goutte de pluye l. stilla* in Lagadeuc's Catholicon and *bar glao* 'a shower of rain' in E. Lhuyd's Archaeologia Britannica.

B. *Celtic Words appearing among Old English Interpretations.*

(1) *mind* (gl. *diadema*), Durham Ritual, p. 92.

I will put here the entire second paragraph of the In Natatale Plurimorum Martirum, where the word is on record:—

onfoeð halga varas ric vlittes 7 mindł m'gvlit' of
Accipient sancti regnum decoris et diadema speciei de

honde driht' f'ðon svīðra his giscilde hia 7 earme
manu Domini, quoniam dextera sua teget eos et brachio

halgū his giscilde hia
sancto suo defendet illos.

Mind is, of course, identical with O'Mulconry's *mind* (gl. *bratium*), which is explained as 'a diadem placed on a soldier's head after victory,' *bratiium* (read *brauium* = βραβεῖον) *didiu mind doberar for cend miled iar coscar* (see Stokes, Archiv, I 315). In the Lecan Glossary *mind* appears as gloss to *breacht* (*brecht*), see Stokes, Archiv, I 71.

Digitized by Google

(2) *givæld* (gl. *coma*), Durham Ritual, p. 96.

The word occurs twice on the same page; first, in the Oratio Pro Renuntiantibus Seculo etc., and then in the Oratio Postquam Tonsura Facta Est. I will just quote a line or two:—

esne ðinū seðe to ofsettene givæld ł heafdes his
famulo tuo, illo, qui ad deponendam comam capitis sui etc.;

esne ðin ðæs todæg givæld heafdes his f'e godcunde
famulum tuum cuius hodie comam capitis sui pro diuino

lvfv ve bid ł voe ofscyvfon[1]
amore deposuimus.

Givæld is Anglicizing of W. *gwallt* = Ir. *folt* 'hair of head.'

(3) *sceng* in *brydsceng* (gl. *thoro*), Durham Ritual, p. 110:—

ƿvnie anv bryd scean' gifoegedo
maneat uni thoro juncta.

Scean' = *scaeng* = *sceng* is identical with OIr. *sceng* 'bed,' on record also in the Lecan Glossary; see Stokes, Archiv, I 93. According to him, Ir. *sceng* is itself a loan from ON. *skinn*, prehistoric form **skenpa*.

(4) *drisne* (gl. *capillamenta*), WW. 199, 8 *capillamenta rawe* (= *ruwe*), *drisne*; ibid. 130, 35 *capillamenta rupe* (= *ruwe*, Sievers) *oðð*[*e*] *drisne*. *Drisne* is, according to Dr. Henebry, collective of OIr. *driss* (gl. *vepres*), Zeuss², p. 119, note. Cp. Latin *drusus* (C. Gl. L. V 300, 4 *hersutum drus*(*t*)*um*, *pilosum*. Le Catholicon de Jehan Lagadeuc of a. 1499: *barber g. barbier l. barbitonsor. Item drusus*).

To Celtic also seems to point the *criid*, glossing *scaturit*, in the Corpus Glossary S 150, which Steinmeyer compared with the gloss *scaturirent cridu* (Ahd. Gl. I 298, 30). I would refer to the *creham* (gl. *uibro*), Luxembourg folio, p. 2, No. 35, and, more especially, to *crihot* = *crihet* (Rhŷs), glossing *uibrat*, ibid., p. 1, No. 22. Concerning the curious OE. interpretation of *spatula* by *bed*, on record in the Erfurt-Epinal (C. G. L. V 392, 51) as well as in the Corpus S 475, I would compare *bad* in *culebad* 'Fliegenwedel' (gl. *flabellum*), cited by Stokes, Linguistic Value of the Irish Annals, p. 6. He connects *cule-* with Lat. *culex*, but says

[1] The interpretation *ve bid* = *ve bid'* presupposes, of course, a reading of the lemma like *te precamur*.

Digitized by Google

of *bad* that it is obscure to him. That *bad* (*bed*) expresses something like German *Wedel* appears from the Scripture gloss *spatulas rami a similitudine spati dicti*, C. G. L. V 388, 34.

C. *Celtic Words Latinized.*

(1) *beta* 'birch'; cf. Ir. *beithi* (*beilhe*, *bethi*): *beta berc arbor dicitur*, C. G. L. V 347, 15 (Epinal-Erfurt) = Corpus B 66.

(2) *gunna* (gl. *heden*) : W. *gwn* = Ir. *fuan* (gl. *lacerna*).

gunna . heden, Corpus G 185; this OE. *heden* is, of course, the same that glosses *casla*, ibid. C 224, and Sweet, OET., p. 551 a, does not quite hit its meaning by translating 'dress,' a translation which he repeats in his Student's Dictionary. He might have seen from the *hæðen*, glossing *mastruga*, Wright-Wülker 450, 35, and the *hedene*, appearing as the alternative of *sciccilse*, *basincge*, Mone 361, 89—the lemma *magistri . . melote* has by chance been omitted—that a cloak or mantle was meant, made of coarse cloth or skins; in fact, the Scholia Bernensia say plainly that it was of skins *gunnae* were made; see ad Georg. III 383 fuluis; uestes de pellibus, quae uocantur renones, ut Salustius dicit, quia pecudum de pellibus faciunt gunnas, quibus uestiuntur omnes barbari, id est ouium et caprarum luporumque utuntur. In regard to *luporum* cp. ON. *úlf-héðenn* = *úlf-hamr*. On Icelandic *heðinn* 'a cape of skin' see Cockayne, Leechd. II 391, from whom equally might have been got a proper conception of *heden*. Curiously mistaken as to the meaning of the word is E. Zupitza, Die german. Gutturale, p. 207; he connects *heden* with Lat. *catīnus*, evidently misled by the glossator of MS Harl. 3376, who, for the sake of convenience, arranged under *one* head *cocula aalfatu* and *cocula* (= *cucula* = *cuculla*[1]) *crusne uel heden*, but from 214, 36, *cocula* (= *cucul(l)a*) *crusne uel heden*, the mistake might easily have been corrected.

(3) *gunnarius* from *gunna*.

Artepellones gunnarii, C. G. L. V 441, 32; the *artepello* is evidently what one might call in German a 'Kunstfellner.'

(4) *gergenna* (gl. *sticca*); cf. Ir. *gerrcend* 'cross-bar, bolt,' Rev. Celt. XIII 506.

Gerrcend is, according to Prof. Kuno Meyer, a changing by

[1] This *o* for *u* is another Celtic characteristic, of which I intend to speak more fully at some later time.

Digitized by Google

popular etymology of the Gaulish *gergenna*, as if it were 'short head.' *Gergenna* is on record in Adamnan's Life of St. Columba, II 16 gergennaque operculi (sc. uasculi nouo lacte pleni) per sua bina foramina retrusa longius proiecta est, operculum terra tenus cecidit, lac ex maiore mensura defusum est. This, Prof. Meyer says, is the only instance of the word on record. The glosses record it twice: *gergenna sticca*, WW. 274, 3 = 414, 10.

(5) *ligo* (gl. *tinctura*); cf. *lig .i. dath* 'colour,' O'Dav. 103, quoted by Stokes, Archiv, I 86.
ligo tinctura uel fosorium, C. G. L. V 372, 1.

(6) *ludari(u)s* (gl. *steor*); cf. W. *lhudon* 'the young of several animals' answering to Lat. *pullus*; Cornish *lodzhon* 'a bullock'; cf. also Salisbury's *llwdyn* in *llwdyn dafad* 'A weder.'
ludaris steor, C. G. L. V 369, 30 (Epinal-Erfurt); the Corpus L 298 has *ludarius*; a diminutive is on record, Ahd. Gl. III 443, 59, *ludellus stierlin*; ibid. 443, 60, *ludella chalbe.*

(7) *ogastrum* (gl. *æggemong*); cf. OIr. *og* 'egg.'
ogastrum æggimong, C. G. L. V 376, 5 (Erfurt) = Corpus O 139; the Epinal's interpretation reads *æggimang*. The Corpus offers as variations of the lemma *olgastrum*, O 149, and *agastrum*, A 397, which are evidently mistakes.

I expect to be able, at a later date, to deal more fully with glosses like *flabanus suan* (Epinal-Erfurt), C. G. L. V 361, 4 = Corpus F 218, where Ir. *fál* 'hedge' seems to be underlying; also *prae(ter)sor(i)um pund* (*paad*), Epinal-Erfurt, C. G. L. V 381, 7 = Corpus P 832; P 739 (*praesorium*) require a fuller discussion. I will, however, mention here that I believe Adamnan's *praetersorium* 'stray cattle' to belong here, and that Ir. *scor* 'paddock' may be the base. As to the Epinal-Erfurt gloss, C. G. L. V 381, 8 prifeta thriu uuintri steor, I hope to show that the lemma ought to read *trioeta* (connected with τριετής), and that Corpus Glossary B 91, *becta stęrt*, is = *ueta stęrc*, with which cf. *bouectus* (= *bouetus*) *stere*, WW. 568, 34. In my letter to Dr. Stokes I tried to connect *tri-ueta* with Ir. *triath* 'boar,' which he was kind enough to favor, and I am happy to see that in Archiv f. kelt. Lexik. I 322 he says that "*triath* is perhaps from *tri-veto-*, cognate with τριετής."

OTTO B. SCHLUTTER.

Digitized by Google

VIII.—THE SOURCE OF THE SO-CALLED ACHAEAN-DORIC KOINH.

It is an established fact in the history of the Greek dialects that the complete supremacy of the Attic κοινή was for a time retarded by the spread in Western Greece, under the influence of the Aetolian and Achaean leagues, of another κοινή, now commonly known as the Achaean-Doric κοινή. So, for example, Brugmann, Griechische Grammatik[3], p. 22, after Meister and others. The thesis which this brief paper attempts to establish is that even this κοινή is an indirect witness to the influence of the Attic κοινή, for, although based in the main upon the dialects of the Northwest Greek group, it is in a measure an artificial product for which the Attic κοινή has furnished not only the suggestion, but also certain specific elements.

Although certain forms in late inscriptions of various Peloponnesian dialects had already been attributed to the influence of the Aetolian league (cf., for example, Cauer, Delectus, Nos. 30, 462, with notes, Smyth, Dialects of North Greece, pp. 13 ff.), it was Meister who, in his classification of the Arcadian inscriptions (Gr. Dial. II, pp. 81 ff.), called attention somewhat more specifically to this element, and gave it the name which has gained considerable currency, the Achaean-Doric κοινή. This dialect, he remarks, is the same as that spoken in Phthiotis, Epirus, Acarnania, Aetolia and Phocis, the same which formed the basis of all Doric dialects. But this is only another way of stating that the same κοινή appears in the inscriptions of the countries named, dating from the 3d and 2d centuries B. C., and that it possesses many peculiarities common to all Doric dialects; the question of its real origin is not answered thereby. Of the dialects originally spoken in these districts, the only one of which we have any knowledge is the Phocian, and this Old Phocian is something quite different from the later κοινή. The dialect of Locris, not included in the districts named by Meister, is the only other Northwest Greek dialect known in its purity, and this again is different. For the others we must agree with Blass: "Es kann weder der dorische Dialekt des Aetolischen Bundes als echt aetolisch gelten,

Digitized by Google

noch ist der Dialekt der akarnanischen Inschriften etwas anderes als der importierte korinthische.[1] Ebenso verhält es mit Epeirus."

But, one may say, if we have no direct knowledge of the Old Aetolian, is it not at least possible that it was just the dialect which appears in the later κοινή? I think not. There are certain elements in the latter which we can not believe to have existed in Old Aetolian,—for example, the conjunction εἰ, which, barring late inscriptions, is not found outside of Attic-Ionic and Arcadian. We may be sure that Old Aetolian inscriptions, if we had them, would show αἰ like Locrian, Phocian, Boeotian and Thessalian, not to speak of the Doric dialects of the Peloponnesus. We are driven to the conclusion that the Ach.-Dor. κοινή does not represent any one of the Northwest Greek dialects in its purity, but even in its earliest appearance bears witness to some external influence. This influence can only be that of the Attic κοινή, which was at the same period affecting to a greater or less degree the dialects of other parts of Greece. So, for example, at Delphi. It has been commonly assumed that the difference between the language of the old inscriptions and that of the manumission decrees was due to the Aetolian influence. But the newly discovered temple-accounts (Bull. corr. hell., '96, 197 ff. = Collitz, No. 2502), dating from the time of Alexander the Great, show that before the Aetolians set foot in Delphi the local dialect was losing its purity and showing an admixture of Attic forms. This inscription has, for example, the personal ending -μεν beside the native -μες, dat. plur. -σι beside the 'Aeolic' -εσσι (ἱερομνάμοσι beside πρυτανίεσσι), εἴκοσι beside ἴκατι, εἰς in place of ἐν cum acc., ὀβολός in place of ὀδελός, once gen. sg. in -εως, etc. Similarly the modified form of Doric seen in late inscriptions of various Doric islands of the Aegean is clearly due to the influence of the Attic κοινή.

Among examples of Attic forms in the Ach.-Dor. κοινή may be mentioned:

1. The universal use of εἰ in place of αἰ.

2. The use of πρῶτος in place of πρᾶτος, e. g. in Collitz, Nos. 1461 (Phthiotis), 1529 (Phocis), 1614 (Achaea). Meister gives πρᾶτος as the Ach.-Dor. form. The occasional appearance of the gen-

[1] This is true of the tomb-inscription found in the north of Acarnania (CIG. 1794 h, Roberts 106), which shows the Corinthian alphabet and the kind of Doric epic that one meets in the early inscriptions of Corcyra. An inscription of Stratos, of the early 4th century, is in the Ionic alphabet and shows possible Attic influence. Cf. Bechtel, Hermes, 31, 318.

Digitized by Google

uine Doric form would not be surprising, but I have no citation for this.

3. The prevalence of *οἱ* over *τοί*. The latter is the only form in Old Phocian, Locrian, Boeotian and the Doric dialects of the Peloponnesus. Nearly all the Aetolian and Achaean inscr. show *οἱ*, though the late Delphian retains the *τοί* with more persistency (but *οἱ* also frequent; sometimes *τοί* and *οἱ* in same inscr., e. g. Collitz, 1707).

4. The prevalence of *ἱερός* over *ἰαρός*, though both are found. The genuine Northwest Greek form was certainly *ἰαρός*, as in Old Phocian (Collitz, 2501, inscribed at Athens, has *ἰαρός*, *ἰαρόω*, but also *ἱερομνάμονες* beside *ἰαρομνάμονες*, and *ἱερομηνία*. These forms in *ἱερο-* are probably due to Attic influence, as it is unlikely that the pure Phocian used both *ἰαρό-* and *ἱερό-*), Boeotian, Elean and the Doric dialects.

5. The frequency of *εἰς* beside *ἐν* cum acc., sometimes on the same inscription, e. g. Collitz, 1411, 1415. In general *ἐν* is more common than *εἰς* in Northern Greece, but in Achaean inscriptions it is not found. The difference may be accounted for by the assumption that the genuine Achaean form was never *ἐν*, as in Northwest Greek and Elean, but *ἐς* (less probably *εἰς*), as in Peloponnesian Doric. This is borne out by the contrast of Achaean *ἔστε* 'until' (Collitz, 1615) with Northwest Greek *ἔντε*.

6. The occasional appearance of *εἶναι* and *πρὸς*. These are included by Meister in his list of Ach.-Dor. characteristics (l. c., pp. 82–3), but they are far less common than *εἶμεν* and *ποτὶ*, and so belong to what may be called a second stratum of Attic.

7. To this stratum of later or occasional Atticisms belong: genitives like *βασιλέως* (Collitz, 1416–17), *πόλεως* (Collitz, 4576, Laconia); forms with *ττ* as *θάλαττα* (Collitz, 1410, 1636), *τέτταρες* (*τεττάροις* with Aetolian dative, Collitz, 1539, Phocis); *ἐάν* (e. g. Collitz, 1634, which also has *εἴ κα*); *ἕως ἄν* (Collitz, 1545, Phocis; 4516, Laconia, etc.); imperat. *ὄντων*, part. *ὤν* (e. g. Collitz, 1410; on Delphian manumission decrees *ὄν* and *ἐών* are used indiscriminately, e. g. 1757); imperat. *-τωσαν*; *εἴκοσι*, etc., etc.

Hitherto we have not questioned the propriety of regarding all that goes under the name of Achaean-Doric as a single *κοινή*. Yet the language is far from uniform. Not only are there widely different degrees in the amount of Attic influence shown (contrast, for example, the semi-Attic *εἴ κα* with the wholly Attic *ἐάν*), but, aside from this, the groundwork is not quite the same in

Digitized by Google

the dialect spread through Aetolian and that spread through Achaean influence. Only the former has ἐν cum acc. and the dative plural of consonant stems in -ους (φερόντους, etc.). It would be better, then, to distinguish the Aetolian κοινή and the Achaean κοινή. It must be remembered also that Attic influence shows itself more or less in nearly all Doric dialects, from the 4th century on, and, except for the specific Aetolian features just mentioned, the result is not essentially different.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, *July*, 1900. CARL DARLING BUCK.

Digitized by Google

IX.—ETYMOLOGY AND SLANG.

1) Latin *studet*.[1]—Personally, I get no satisfaction from that etymology of *studet* which compares it with Gk. σπεύδει 'hastens,'[2] and writes an Aryan base PSTEUD-. As accurate a single definition as we can give to *studet* is 'aims at,' and if we further paraphrase this by 'strikes at, for,' we open up the possibility of correlating *studet* with *tundit* 'strikes.'[3] Goth. *stautan*, Alban. *shtiń* are *s*-derivatives of the same base. A close student is called in the vernacular of to-day a 'grind' or 'dig.' Progress in etymology for the immediate future will mean progress in semantics rather than the discovery of new phonetic correspondences. All written languages are stiff and stilted as compared with the vernaculars out of which they are sprung. It is in the field of the spoken vernacular, of language in the nude, that we must hope to find the clue to developments of meaning that have taken place in words now so clothed upon by the formalities of written language that the skeleton beneath is hardly to be divined. Only in the vernacular—in slang—is popular psychology freely at work, reshaping, ever anew, primitive semantic types.

2) Latin *pudet*.—After these preliminary remarks I need not apologize for rendering *me pudet* by our frequent vernacular phrase 'I could kick myself,' a phrase by which we express impatience at an act of folly.[4] Not alien is the metaphor of Aeschylus, Prometheus 881: "the heart *kicks* at the mind for fear."

3) Latin *repudium*.—An underbred young woman of to-day *kicks* her suitors. In Latin, *repudium* is the (parental) rejection of a proposal of marriage. It is clear that I regard *pud-* in the words *pudet* and *repudium* as akin to the word *pēs* 'foot.' We might

[1] The older literature can be controlled by referring to Kuhn's Zeitschrift, 4, 34; 8, 450; 11, 91; 12, 409, 428; 13, 307.

[2] So Wharton and Prellwitz, in their etymological vocabularies.

[3] Cf. Meillet in Mém. Soc. Ling. 9, 154,—without development of the semantics.

[4] Wharton defines *pudet* by 'is stricken,' Schweizer-Sidler (K. Z. 18, 303) by 'es schlägt nieder,' Bréal (Mém. Soc. Ling. 5, 31) by 'frapper.'

Digitized by Google

suppose *pudet* to have got its vowel-color from compounds, and even to have carried *pudor* along with it. There is another possibility, however, as the word now to be discussed shows.

4) πῡδαρίζει 'hops, dances.'—It is tempting to compare this verb with *tripodat* 'dances the three-step'; and it reminds one of the song of Ariel in Shakespeare's Tempest: "Foot it featly here and there"; or of George Meredith's "Now the youth footed swift to the dawn" (in The Day of the Daughter of Hades). If πῡδαρίζει is cognate with πούς 'foot,' we shall have to account for the vocalization. Are we to suppose that PŎD- ever had a form *pŭd-* beside it? and further to imagine, perhaps, a base PŎUD-? If so, the riddle of πούς is solved. We might apply to the bases PŌUD- PŎD- PĔD- PŬD- the principle already suggested for SĒID- SĔD- SŎD- SĬD- (v. Brugmann, Grundriss, I², §549 *c*.). The same principle of gradation allows us to correlate Lat. *caupo* 'huckster' with Gk. κάπηλος, and Lat. *capit* with *cupit* (v. Wharton, Etym. Lat., s. v.), without coming into irreconcilable conflict with other explanations (v., e. g., Uhlenbeck, Altind. Wört., s. v. *kúpyati*).

5) Latin *piget*.—I would connect *piget* and *pingit*, the latter with a formal meaning of 'paints,' developed from a vernacular 'pricks, tattoos.' I put beside *eum piget* the phrase 'he is all cut up,' or, the same metaphor in elevated language, 'his conscience pricks him.'[1] I also note our words 'tired' (: tear) and 'bored.' We can also explain in this way *piger*, with a formal meaning of 'slow, lazy,' but comparable with our vernacular substantive 'stick, stick-in-the-mud.' So also we reach an explanation for

6) Latin *tardus*.—Its formal meaning is 'slow,' but in our vernacular 'pokey.' It belongs with Skr. *tṛṇdánti* 'they pierce, poke.'

7) Latin *paenitet*.[2]—It is an easy thing to mediate between *pingit* 'pricks' and *pangit* 'fastens.'[3] A knife 'pricks' or 'sticks,' mucilage 'sticks' or 'fastens,' a pin 'pricks,' 'sticks,' and 'fastens.' If we note the perfect *pegit* (: *pangit*), we might suppose that *paenitet*—this orthography being best warranted historically, but without bearing on the etymology—comes from **pĕgnitet* (perhaps

[1] Moeller (K. Z. 24, 493) defines by 'es sticht mich,' and Wharton (l. c.) compares *pungit* 'pricks.'

[2] Literature in K. Z. 14, 146; 19, 406; B. B. 22, 124; Mém. Soc. Ling. 5, 429.

[3] Of course, *pungit* 'pricks' is a cognate. The bases *ping- pang- pung-* must be reconciled by phonetic or analogical manipulation.

Digitized by Google

even from *păgnitet*; cf. my explanations of *fenum lena* in Class. Rev. 11, 298); and so *me paenitet* may also be turned by 'it pricks my conscience.' A kindred metaphor is seen in the word 'remorse.' It is possible also, considering Germ. *fast* 'almost,' which is a cognate of our verb *fastens* 'binds,' to connect *paene* 'almost' with *pegit* 'he fastened.' I would explain *pēnuria* as from a desiderative formation with the meaning 'desire to fasten upon.'

In line with the semantic explanations offered for *piget* and *paenitet* we may proceed to the consideration of

8) Latin *taedet*.[1]—This I derive from TEGSD- or TEGD- (with $\hat{g}$). I note Skr. *tákṣati* 'cuts,' akin to Lat. *texit* 'weaves,' *tangit* 'touches, pricks'; cf. *acu tetigisti* 'hast touched with a needle'; and does not Vergil make Dido say in soliloquy (Aen. IV 596): infelix Dido, nunc te facta impia tangunt? We have perhaps a *-d*-extension of this root in Skr. *tāḍáyati* 'beats, (cuts with a stick—whip)'; at least we may regard the *ḍ* as the product of *-ĝd-*, if *īḍé* 'I worshipped' be correctly correlated with *vájate* 'sacrifices' (v. Wackernagel, Altind. Gram., §145). We may also explain *taeda* 'torch' from the 'tips' of flame or as (pine) 'splinters.' This etymology will also account for *taeter* 'stinking.' Smells are not only 'pungent,' but they 'knock us down.'

The words *pudet piget paenitet* and *taedet* have all been explained by kindred metaphors. This is amply justified by their identical syntax. The frequency of the metaphor I have used for these explanations is too great in our own vernacular for any one to take exception to this frequency in Latin. To say nothing of the full-dress exhibitions of the metaphor in 'remorse,' 'pricks and stings of conscience,'—in 'it touches me, wounds me, annoys me, cuts me to the quick,' we have a plentiful array of vernacular phrases,—'it hacks me, makes me tired (: tear), bores me, beats my time,'—'I am all cut up, broken up,'—'I could kick myself, he has gone to pieces.' These phrases all indicate various sorts of mental confusion, hesitation, and dismay, likened, metaphorically, to the effects of piercing or striking.

AUSTIN, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS. EDWIN W. FAY.

[1] K. Z. 13, 307; 16, 198; 18, 303; 19, 80.

Digitized by Google

REVIEW.

Parmenides im Kampfe gegen Heraklit, von Prof. Dr. A. PATIN. Leipzig, Teubner, 1899.

The license of affirmation in which specialists indulge with regard to the Pre-Socratics is a perpetual amazement to scholars who have themselves no thesis to defend. Of the originals we possess at the best mutilated fragments, the correct reading and juncture of which depend on our conception of the system of doctrine to which they belong, even as our knowledge of the system, in turn, rests on our restoration and reconstruction of the text. Our sources for these texts and their interpretation are Plato, Aristotle, and later Stoic, Neo-Platonic, and Christian essayists and commentators. Plato used historic personages merely as typical representatives of the ideas which he wished to bring on the stage, and shrank from no anachronism and no misquotation or misinterpretation that helped his artistic design.[1]

Aristotle translates every doctrine into his own technical terminology and criticizes all early thinkers by the application of distinctions foreign to their thought. The later commentators are wholly lacking in the historic sense, quote frequently at second hand, and always with some intention of polemic or edification.

The striking sayings, the brilliant *aperçus*, the most distinctive dogmas of the great Pre-Socratic philosophers we know. The precise logical coherence of their 'thought,' its psychological evolution in their own minds, we can only conjecture. The evidence is enough to supply an artist of the quality of Renan, Pater, or Jowett with the materials for an interesting and plausible sketch of the possible or probable course of early Greek thought. It is utterly insufficient as a basis for vigorous and rigorous scholastic demonstrations of its precise actual historical development in detail. Yet for this very reason the Pre-Socratic philosophy is a favorite field of the new scholasticism of 19th-century philology. As Mr. Rodier observes in refuting a venturesome hypothesis of Tannery concerning the composition of Aristotle's Physics, it is dangerous to apply to Plato or Aristotle the method of rigid deduction or ingenious combinatory manipulation of a few selected texts—'il en reste trop.' But in the case of the

[1] Parmenides, v. 98, as quoted in Theaetet. 180 E, presents the dilemma of a deadlock between Plato and the modern reconstructions of the text. On one side or the other there is total misapprehension.

Digitized by Google

Pre-Socratics the lack of evidence leaves the imagination free scope. How inadequate the evidence is, no one can appreciate who has not attempted to tabulate the readings and interpretations that have been proposed for some of the great keynote phrases of Heraclitus, Parmenides and Empedocles, or to harmonize the ingenious schemes that have been imagined for the rings of Anaximander, the 'crowns' of Parmenides, the cycles of Empedocles.

Patin's Parmenides im Kampfe gegen Heraklit is one of the most astonishing performances of modern philology in this field, and its publication, following Diels' indispensable edition of Parmenides, presents a convenient opportunity for concrete illustration of the methods of what I have called the new scholasticism.

I shall arrange my observations in such form that, while constituting a review of Patin's laborious and ingenious work, they may also serve as a slight introduction and guide to the study of Parmenides.

The chief problems presented by the 155-60 lines of extant fragments are: (1) The significance in Parmenides' philosophy of the distinction between Truth and Opinion. (2) His conception of Being and of Non-being. (3) The meaning of his seeming identification of Thought and Being. (4) His relation to Heraclitus—the main topic of Patin's book. To these might be added, as an appendix, the reconstruction of his cosmology.

(1) The distinction between metaphysics as the way of truth, and physics as the way of opinion, is familiar from Plato's Timaeus.[1] We know what this means in Plato. For Plato the way of truth is pure dialectic, and deductive teleological reasoning. The way of opinion is the study of secondary physical causes regarded as indispensable ministrants of the higher order. He does not, except in momentary outbursts of transcendental rhetoric, deny a certain kind of reality to the shifting phenomena of sense. He merely rates them lower in the scale of moral and intellectual values. Having made the logical distinction between the absolute μὴ ὄν, or metaphysical negation of Being, and the relative μὴ ὄν of ordinary negative predication,[2] he is able to say poetically of the things of generation and decay that they occupy a place midway between the existent and the non-existent.[3] Parmenides is in possession of no such distinction. *Is* (altogether) or *is not* (at all) is the sharp alternative for his naïver thought.[4] And he is further hampered by the difficulty of expressing precise shades of thought in the vague, prolix and conventional diction of the hexameter. Plato's prose can express nice and delicate gradations in the scale of Being and certainty. But we can not be sure that Parmenides is not forced to say more than he means by such tags as ταῖς οὐκ ἔνι πίστις ἀληθής (30) or κόσμον

[1] 29 B. Cf. A. J. P. IX 413-14.
[2] Sophist 256 E sqq.
[3] Rep. 477 A, 478 D.
[4] V. 72.

Digitized by Google

ἐμῶν ἐπέων ἀπατηλὸν ἀκούων (112), which certainly imply a more entire scepticism than the διάκοσμον ἐοικότα πάντα φατίσω of v. 120.

On which idea does he really wish to lay the stress? Is it merely on the comparative uncertainty of the things of opinion as contrasted with our absolute assurance of the way of truth? Or does he intend to reject the world and way of opinion as utterly fallacious and unreal, and set it in antithetic opposition to the world of pure Being? For Tannery the matter is very simple. The conceptions of the Pre-Socratics are wholly material, he thinks. The eternal motion is always and only the diurnal revolution of the heavens. Parmenides denied this motion because he made the universe finite, and left it no space to move in, and nothing outside of itself to which its motion could be related. But he had only to assume the fixity of the outer circumference, the ἔσχατος Ὄλυμπος, to conciliate the doctrine of the rest of the whole with change in the parts. This is simple and perspicuous enough, but it is inconsistent with the text, and the tradition of antiquity. Parmenides uses the non-existence of void to prove the continuity of the all, but not to prove its immovability, which he merely assumes (v. 82). And, as Patin points out, he affirms the repose and homogeneity of the whole throughout, and not merely of the outer shell.

Diels holds that Parmenides set forth his physics in order to provide his 'school' with themes for dialectical exercitations *sic et non*. This assumes, of course, the theory of the famous essay 'Ueber die ältesten Philosophenschulen der Griechen,' and when, after having been told for many years that it had 'proved' this and that, I at last read the essay, I made a discovery which any student may verify who will go through it, pen in hand, and excerpt the positive evidence cited in support of its thesis—the discovery, namely, that there is not the slightest proof of the existence of 'schools' among the Pre-Socratics outside of medical guilds and the Pythagorean societies.

Zeller sensibly opines that Parmenides, despite his scepticism, made a plausible eclectic presentation of the contemporary physical theories in order that the reader, as he says, might be fully informed, and choose the true doctrine with the greater confidence.

Lastly, Patin has developed a peculiar view of his own. Parmenides, he thinks, regarded the world of change as an illusion, but as a necessary and consistent illusion which a complete philosophy must therefore expound and explain. This illusion presents itself to the average man very much in the form of the Heraclitean philosophy. The multitude Heraclitizes. And hence Parmenides' polemic against Heraclitus often assumes the form of a denunciation of the folly of mankind.

Let us turn to the texts. The first is a part of the speech of the goddess in the introduction (28 sqq.): χρεὼ δέ σε πάντα πυθέσθαι | ἠμὲν Ἀληθείης εὐπειθέος ἀτρεμὲς ἦτορ | ἠδὲ βροτῶν δόξας, ταῖς οὐκ

Digitized by Google

ἔνι πίστις ἀληθής. | *ἀλλ' ἔμπης καὶ ταῦτα μαθήσεαι, ὡς τὰ δοκοῦντα* | *χρῆν δοκίμως εἶναι διὰ παντὸς πάντα περῶντα.*

For *εὐπειθέος* Diels reads *εὐκυκλέος*. The transfer of the epithet 'circular' from the sphere to the truth he regards as an apt illustration of the confusion of the objective and the subjective in primitive thought. Patin outbids him in this vein by observing: "Soferne die Wahrheit ein schlagloses Herz hat, ist sie einfach dasselbe wie das bewegungslose ruhende Sein." But the crux is in the last line and a half. The manuscripts of Simplicius have *δοκίμως εἶναι*. Diels reads *δοκιμῶσ'* (inf. !), construes *εἶναι* with *δοκοῦντα*, and renders "wie man alles und jedes durchgehen und dabei jenes Scheinwesen auf die Probe stellen sollte." *χρῆν*, which is easily emended to *χρή*, he retains as a 'polite *irrealis*.' There is a great variety of emendations: *δοκιμωσέμεναι* (Bergk), *δοκίμως ἰέναι*, *γνῶναι*, or *κρῖναι*, which yields the easiest sense, etc. But all express much the same fundamental meaning—that it behooves the thinker to test all things approvedly, or to test the things of opinion by opinion. It is in part the idea attributed to Zeno and Parmenides by Plato, Parmen. 136 D: *ἀγνοοῦσι γὰρ οἱ πολλοὶ ὅτι ἄνευ ταύτης τῆς διὰ πάντων διεξόδου καὶ πλάνης ἀδύνατον ἐντυχόντα τῷ ἀληθεῖ νοῦν ἔχειν.* Loetzing, however (Ber. phil. Wochenschrift, 51, p. 1571), proposes "wie man alles durchforschend . . . (als wahrscheinlich) annehmen müsste das sich das Scheinende verhalte." But no one but the author of such a version will accept *δοκιμῶς'* in the sense 'assume as probable,' or admit that *ὡς τὰ δοκοῦντα εἶναι* can mean 'wie sich das Scheinende verhalte.'

Patin has a still more ingenious version to offer. He reads *δοκίμως ἰέναι*, etc., and renders 'wie das Scheinbare scheinbar alles durchdringend durch das ganze verlaufen muss,' i. e. the absolute unity and repose is the truth, but the Heraclitean process running through all things is the necessary illusion. This thought he confirms by pressing the phraseology of the last lines of the poem: *οὕτω τοι κατὰ δόξαν ἔφυ τάδε νῦντε ἔασι* | *καὶ μετέπειτ' ἀπὸ τοῦδε τελευτήσουσι τραφέντα*—an affirmation not that such are the opinions of men, but that so things are and ever will be according to opinion. And he finds further support in the Heraclitean etymology of *δίκαιον*—*διὰ . . . παντὸς εἶναί τι διεξιόν*, etc., Plato, Cratyl. 412 D, and in the etymological word-play *δοκοῦντα*—*δοκίμως*, which reminds him of Her. fr. 118: *δοκεόντων δοκιμώτατος*. It is the familiar method of taking as possible, probable, proved what is at the most a barely conceivable ingenious fancy.

In another matter, however, I entirely concur with Patin. It is commonly said that Parmenides' system of physics can not be his own, and is probably that of the Pythagoreans. Patin, who has a sense of humor where the 'combinations' of other scholars are involved, points out that we know the physics of Pythagoras from —Parmenides, and that the spirit of his exposition proves that the doctrine is substantially his own. This, I think, is one of the few things of which we may be certain. The glad Empedoclean or

Digitized by Google

Lucretian tone of 133 sqq.: *εἶσῃ δ' αἰθερίην τε φύσιν τά τ' ἐν αἰθέρι πάντα | σήματα*—the spirit of this passage is incompatible with the view that Parmenides is merely resuming, for polemical purposes, the doctrines of others—to say nothing of the fact that there is no evidence that physical and astronomical problems were used by the Eleatics for dialectical exercitations. This, of course, does not preclude our guessing the extent to which Parmenides' conceptions of the world were influenced by any or all of his predecessors—*δόκος ἐπὶ πᾶσι τέτυκται.*

In the few remaining passages that concern this branch of the subject the following points only need notice: We must not identify the opinions of mortals, the uncertainties or illusions of physics (111 sqq.), with the absolutely false and forbidden path of Non-being (37 sqq., 50 sqq.). Interpreters not infrequently borrow the language in which Non-being is rejected, to emphasize Parmenides' scepticism with regard to physical doctrines. But the two things are perfectly distinct in the poem. The only possible link of connection is in the doubtful passage 113–14: *Μορφὰς γὰρ κατέθεντο δύο γνώμας* (or *γνώμης*) *ὀνομάζειν | τῶν μίαν οὐ χρεών ἐστιν ἐν ᾧ πεπλανημένοι εἰσίν.*

The precise meaning of 114 we can not determine, but it can not possibly bear the interpretation which Zeller, relying on the testimony of Aristotle, puts upon it. Aristotle says (Met. 987 a 1) that of Parmenides' two physical principles, fire corresponded to *ὄν* and earth to *μὴ ὄν*. Hence Zeller interprets 114 as a parenthetical protest against the recognition of Non-being as one of the two elements. This is plainly impossible. I shall recur to *μὴ ὄν* later. It may in some contexts be virtually equivalent to empty space, but after thus identifying it with the void, it is too much to ask us to believe that it is also the 'compact and heavy body,' the *πυκινὸν δέμας ἐμβριθές τε* of v. 119. Tannery, while rejecting Zeller's interpretation, somewhat inconsistently retains his translation: "c'est une de trop, et c'est en cela que consiste l'erreur." He identifies *μὴ ὄν* with the void, the light element with the Pythagorean *ἄπειρον*, and the dense with the *πέρας*. But he gives no reason why, after having once turned from the world of Being to the world of Opinion, Parmenides should introduce the dualistic system of physics which he had chosen to expound, with a sudden parenthetical and unexplained protest against the assumption of two elements rather than one. If Parmenides preferred unity in the world of Opinion also, there were enough monistic systems ready to his hand.

It is probably the force of these considerations that has driven many scholars, following Simplicius, to construe 'to assume *one only* is an error'—but the ellipsis is too harsh to be probable. Diels adds a further refinement. He accepts the substance of Zeller's interpretation, but not his translation, which he thinks would require *ἑτέρην* instead of *μίαν*. He himself includes *τῶν μίαν οὐ χρεών ἐστιν* in the indirect report of the opinion of men, the

Digitized by Google

second half of the line only being Parmenides' parenthetical protest, and renders 'nur eine derselben das *sei* unerlaubt (dabei sind sie freilich in die Irre gegangen).' He thus adds an incredible *oratio obliqua* of his own invention to a combination of the impossible meaning of Zeller and the forced construction of Simplicius. Patin returns to Zeller's interpretation, arguing against '*one only*' that no Pre-Socratic had posited '*one only*,' since even the monistic Ionians had at once developed a world-building antithesis out of the original unity. In support of this argument he sophistically presses μορφάς. Two *forms*, he says, imply one underlying substance. The Parmenidean physics then is, like that of Heraclitus, essentially monistic.

After this the reader will perhaps agree with me that the line is hopeless, and that the easiest, if somewhat desperate, remedy is to exscind.

To sum up:—However hard it may prove to throw a bridge across from noumena to phenomena, every paradoxical system of absolutism is obliged to make concessions to common sense. As Simplicius innocently observes (De Caelo 559–60): δῆλον δὲ ὅτι οὐκ ἠγνόει Παρμενίδης ὅτι γενητὸς αὐτὸς ἦν ὥσπερ οὐδὲ ὅτι δύο πόδας εἶχεν ἐν λέγων τὸ ὄν—a passage, by the way, in which the student of comparative literature may discover the germ of Gomperz' eloquent outburst: "Parmenides sah nach wie vor die Bäume grünen, er hörte die Bäche rauschen, er empfand den Duft der Blumen," etc. This much the humblest student may see, though he may not express it so lyrically. But the specific question of personal psychology we can not answer: By what evasion of dialectic or rhetoric did Parmenides justify to his own mind the derogation from absolute truth involved in the exposition of a system of physics? The reason assigned by the goddess in 121 is ὡς οὐ μὴ ποτέ τίς σε βροτῶν γνώμη (or γνώμῃ) παρελάσσῃ, variously rendered 'that no mortal wisdom may surpass thine,' or that 'no mortal opinion may escape thy ken.' We can hardly go beyond Aristotle's ἀναγκαζόμενος δ' ἀκολουθεῖν τοῖς φαινομένοις.

(2) Parmenides affirms with great iteration and variety of phrase that (It) is, that Being is and that nothing else is or is thinkable. What is this Being? Is it (1) the abstract metaphysical hypostasis *l'être* of Descartes? Or (2) is it the extended spherical substance of the material universe? Or (3) is it the ὄντα and ὄν of Greek dialectic, that is anything and everything of which ἐστι may be predicated, whether as copula or verb of existence—a conception allied to yet differing from (1)? Or (4) if it is no one of these precisely, in what way are these different conceptions blended in Parmenides' thought? The Neo-Platonists who identified it with the ἕν, or ἐν ὄν, of Plato's Parmenides and the older scholars in modern times favor (1). Tannery, Bäumker and Burnet have made (2) the prevailing view to-day. An examination of the texts will, I think, show that (3) or (4) come

Digitized by Google

nearer to the truth, but that we can not be sure of much more than Aristotle's cautious statement: Parmenides seems to touch on the abstract idea of unity: *τοῦ κατὰ τὸν λόγον ἑνὸς.*[1]

The capital question, as Tannery says, is to learn precisely how the thinkers of Greece, in the course of the fifth century, succeeded in disengaging themselves from the concrete and placing themselves at the point of view of the abstract. This movement of thought was predetermined in the character of the Greek mind and the structure of the Greek language. No single Greek invented logic-chopping, and the use of *ὄν* for truth and *μὴ ὄν* for falsehood was a perpetual provocation to the metaphysics of Being and the fallacies that arise from the ambiguity of the copula. Historically, however, we know that the chief influence in this direction before Socrates emanated from the Eleatics. The 'invention' of dialectic is attributed to Zeno, who is supposed to have employed it in the polemical defence of the Parmenidean doctrine. In the Parmenides of Plato the antithesis between the two points of view—the purely sensuous and the abstract dialectic —is clearly stated. But there Socrates censures Zeno for arguing with merely material notions,[2] and the old man Parmenides is represented as approving Socrates' proposal to transfer the debate to the abstract or dialectical plane, and deal with pure concepts. Elsewhere too, though Plato points out the inconsistencies in which materialistic imagery involves the Parmenidean Being,[3] he always implies that the conception was essentially abstract and dialectic. And such, indeed, was the general tradition of antiquity, though Eudemus and some others whose views he reports insisted on the literal acceptance of the image of the compact and rounded sphere.[4]

The evidence of the fragments is contradictory. The introductory affirmation of Being and polemic against Non-being seems a piece of pure abstract dialectic. Line 39: *οὔτε γὰρ ἂν γνοίης τό γε μὴ ἐὸν, οὐ γὰρ ἀνυστόν | οὔτε φράσαις*, might seem to be taken directly from the text of Plato, including the particle *γε*. Cf. Repub. 477 A: *ὁ γιγνώσκων γιγνώσκει τι ἢ οὐδέν . . . τί . . . πότερον ὂν ἢ οὐκ ὄν; ὄν· πῶς γὰρ ἂν μὴ ὄν γέ τι γνωσθείη;* We should be led to the same conclusion by the natural interpretation of the passages that seem to identify Thought and Being, which will be discussed below. Must we reject this interpretation altogether because of the lines in which Being is spoken of as 'full,' 'continuous,' 'holding together,' 'equally poised like the mass of a rounded sphere,' etc.? Similarly in the case of *μὴ ὄν, μηδέν, μὴ εἶναι*. Do these terms sometimes, at least, denote the dialectical *μὴ ὄν* of Plato, or must we uniformly interpret Non-being as the void because the void is sometimes spoken of as Non-being? A

[1] Met. 986 b, 18. *κατὰ λόγον* here virtually means abstract, but with the further suggestion that the abstract point of view is reached by contemplating the thing in its verbal definition.

[2] 129 A sqq. [3] Sophist 244 E. [4] Simplic. Phys. 133, 21.

Digitized by Google

question of terminology must be answered first. Parmenides uses *μὴ εἶναι, οὐκ εἶναι, μηδὲν, μὴ ἐὸν, οὐκ ἐὸν* and *οὔτεον* (Diels). Are these virtually synonyms or can we, with Patin, nicely discriminate between them? Plato, as we have seen, distinguishes the absolute *μὴ ὄν*, unutterable and unthinkable, from the relative *μὴ ὄν* denoting difference or otherness, and applicable to the things of sense midway between Being and Non-being. This distinction, as Eudemus explicitly pointed out in antiquity, is foreign to the more naïve thought of Parmenides. But Patin, even while expressing surprise that Parmenides should have missed so obvious a point, finds something very like it in the use of *εἶναι μὴ ἐόντα*, which he distinguishes from *μὴ ὄν* and refers to the Heraclitean Being in flux. Similarly in l. 50: *οἷς τὸ πέλειν τε καὶ οὐκ εἶναι ταὐτὸν νενόμισται | κ' οὐ ταὐτόν*, he distinguishes *πέλειν* from *εἶναι*, and *οὐκ εἶναι* from *μὴ εἶναι*. *οὐκ εἶναι*, again, refers to the Heraclitean Being subject to change and decay, and means 'nicht eigentlich sein.' So, again, in line 35 he thinks *μὴ εἶναι* is used intentionally in the sense of 'nichtsein,' as distinguished from *μηδὲν*, 'nichts,' and in verse 67 he finds a peculiar significance in the use of *οὐκ*. All this is fanciful. The expressions are practically synonymous, and Parmenides is throughout protesting against any recognition of Non-being, not discriminating its various possible meanings with Platonic nicety. *μὴ* as distinguished from *οὐ* in normal usage undoubtedly generalizes, lends a touch of emphasis,[1] or a suggestion of the conditional. But even in Plato the distinction is often too slight to affect the argument or the philosophic thought.[2] What, then, are we to expect where unripe thought is contending with the difficulties of metre? Closely connected with this is the question whether and how often we are to translate *ἐστι* 'is possible' instead of 'is.' There is no certain example of *ἐστι* 'is possible,' unless it be the imperfect analogy of *εἶσι νοῆσαι* (34). There is little agreement or consistency to be found in editors or commentators. Tannery and Courtney do not use 'is possible' at all. Burnet introduces it wherever 'is' would be too harsh for good prose—the prose of Plato. Diels and Zeller vary. The only good reason for translating *οὐκ ἐστι μὴ εἶναι* (35) 'it is impossible (for it) not to be' instead of 'non-being is not,' is the conviction that *μὴ εἶναι οὐκ ἔστιν* is impossible Greek for Parmenidean verse, as it clearly is for Platonic prose. But in that case the construction should not be admitted anywhere. Yet Diels renders *τὸ γὰρ αὐτὸ νοεῖν ἐστίν τε καὶ εἶναι* 'Denn [das Seiende] denken und sein ist dasselbe,' and *ἐστι γὰρ εἶναι* 'Denn das Sein existirt.' If the infinitive can dispense with the article here, it surely can in

[1] Cf. Jebb on Soph. Ajax 1231.

[2] Cf. Parmen. 160 E sqq.: *τὸ μὴ ὂν ἓν . . . τὸ ἓν οὐκ ὄν.* 163 A: *τὸ ἓν ἄρα μὴ ὄν*, etc., with 164 B: *οὕτω δὴ ἓν οὐκ ὄν*, etc. 163 C: *ὅταν φῶμεν μὴ εἶναί τι πῶς οὐκ εἶναί φαμεν αὐτό*, etc., . . . *ἢ τοῦτο τὸ μὴ ἐστι.* Cf. also Sophist 256 E: *περὶ ἕκαστον . . . πολὺ μὲν ἐστι τὸ ὄν, ἄπειρον δὲ πλῆθει τὸ μὴ ὄν . . .* 263 B: *πολλὰ . . . ἔφαμεν . . . περὶ ἕκαστον . . . οὐκ ὄντα.* And for a late example cf. Themist. on Ar. Phys. I 2: *διὰ τί καὶ τὸ ὂν οὐκ ἐροῦσιν μὴ ὂν καὶ τὸ ἓν οὐχ ἕν;*

Digitized by Google

35. Patin renders 35 '*wie* es ist und dass nichtsein unmöglich ist,' and, as we have seen, thinks μὴ εἶναι 'nichtsein' is intentionally distinguished from μηδὲν 'nichts.' But he too recognizes the other construction. The probabilities are all in favor of taking ἐστι everywhere as 'is,' of accepting εἶναι and μὴ εἶναι without the article as synonyms of ὂν and μὴ ὄν, and of admitting the virtual equivalence of μὴ εἶναι οὐκ εἶναι, etc. The attempt to discriminate introduces improbable subtleties alien to both the manner and the thought of Parmenides.

But what of the identification of μὴ ὄν with empty space? That Parmenides affirmed the plenum and rejected a vacuum appears both from the fragments and from the testimony of Plato and the commentators. Once (106) he actually uses οὐκ ἐὸν (οὔτεον, Diels) as a synonym of the void. But it is impossible to go beyond this and say that by μὴ ἐὸν he means, primarily, the void, and the writers who do affirm it contradict themselves. Thus Tannery says (Science Hellène, p. 122): "la notion du vide absolu n'est pas antérieure aux atomistes"; but on page 222: "le non-être [in Parmenides] c'est l'espace pur et le vide absolu." If, as Teichmüller argues, the conception of the void was first reached by Melissus and Leucippus, it is impossible to understand how Parmenides' polemic could have been directed, in the first instance, against that conception. And if by Non-being he meant primarily the absence of matter rather than the dialectical negation of Being, it is hard to see how this could, as Tannery affirms, yield him an easy victory over the relative void (whatever that may be) of the Pythagoreans, that it would not as easily have won over the pure void of the atomists. Still less can Non-being be at once the void and the dark, heavy element. The chief texts involved are:

(1) 78–81:

οὐδὲ διαιρετόν ἐστιν, ἐπεὶ πᾶν ἐστιν ὁμοῖον·
οὐδέ τι τῇ μᾶλλον, τό κεν εἴργοι μιν συνέχεσθαι
οὐδέ τι χειρότερον, πᾶν δ' ἔμπλεόν ἐστιν ἐόντος.
τῷ ξυνεχὲς πᾶν ἐστιν· ἐὸν γὰρ ἐόντι πελάζει.

(2) 102–107:

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πεῖρας πύματον, τετελεσμένον ἐστί,
πάντοθεν εὐκύκλου σφαίρης ἐναλίγκιον ὄγκῳ,
μεσσόθεν ἰσοπαλὲς πάντῃ· τὸ γὰρ οὔτε τι μεῖζον
οὔτε τι βαιότερον πέλεναι χρεόν ἐστι τῇ ἢ τῇ.
οὔτε γὰρ οὐκ ἐὸν (οὔτεον, Diels) ἔστι, τό κεν παύοι μιν ἱκνεῖσθαι
εἰς ὁμόν, οὔτ' ἐὸν ἔστιν ὅπως εἴη κεν ἐόντος
τῇ μᾶλλον τῇ δ' ἧσσον, ἐπεὶ πᾶν ἐστιν ἄσυλον.

Patin's interpretation of these passages throws into the shade the most brilliant exegesis of the Neo-Platonic commentators. εἴργοι and παύοι, he argues, imply positive forces of separation. They could not be used of the mere passive interposition of

Digitized by Google

space, void or occupied only by rarefied matter. μᾶλλον, then, or μᾶσσον, as he prefers to read, must denote the (hypothetical) stronger force which (if it existed) would defeat the tendency to unity. ἐὸν ἐόντι πελάζει is inconsistent. There is only one Being, and a positive centripetal force is not needed to unify it—its unity is an ultimate fact. But the reference to a positive unifying force escaped Parmenides in the 'heat of controversy' against Heraclitus' separative force. In 106 οὐκ ἐὸν is not equivalent to μὴ ἐὸν and can not, because of παύοι, denote a passive void. It is a hypothetical inferior order of Being. There is no contradiction here, for the office of the superior force supposed above was actively to split asunder. The function of the inferior Being (if it existed) would be merely to hamper the tendency to unity.—It sounds better in the German.

The debate is perhaps a logomachy. In urging that Parmenides' ὄν and μὴ ὄν are something more, and primarily something other, than the material plenum and the void, I do not mean to say that he had attained to the Platonic or Cartesian conception of metaphysical and immaterial Being. I mean merely that Parmenides' own text, simply interpreted, shows that Being for him was largely that ambiguous dialectical Being to which the structure of the Greek language and the development of Greek thought were turning men's minds. Being is ὄν and ὄντα, and ὄν and ὄντα are anything of which we use ἐστι, from the elemental substance of the Pre-Socratics to the ethical and political entities defined by Socrates.[1] This verbal and dialectical use of ὄν inevitably led the Greeks to formulate the antithesis between material and immaterial Being. The synthetic and coupling function of ἐστι implies the activity of mind—the unity of apperception, in Kantian phrase. It is something not found in the things of sense, but added to them by thought—and so we reach the conception of the immaterial.[2] On the other hand, the function of ἐστι is merely to attach to some substance or concrete thing, predicates of quality or relation which can not exist apart from such a substance (χωριστά), and so minds of another type[3] come to regard the concrete material ὑποκείμενον, or the universal material ὑποκείμενον out of which such particulars arise, as the reality or ὄν par excellence. This, of course, is not the only way in which the human mind arrived at this antithesis, but it is one of the ways by which the Greek mind reached it. In Parmenides we see only the beginning of this development. The dialectical verbal notion of Being from which Plato was to extract the idea of pure, immaterial Being dwells side by side in his system with an imaginative, primitive materialism that has never dreamed of any other reality than the extended substance of the visible world. It is a mistake to seek consistency by the elimination of either.

[1] Xen. Mem. IV 6, 1: τί ἕκαστον εἴη τῶν ὄντων. Charmides 166 D: γίγνεσθαι καταφανὲς ἕκαστον τῶν ὄντων ὅπῃ ἔχει.

[2] Theaetet. 185 C sqq.

[3] Aristotle, The Stoics.

Digitized by Google

If Karsten and the older scholars err when they attribute a doctrine of metaphysical Being to Parmenides, so does Burnet when, following Tannery, he says: "Parmenides first asks what is the common presupposition of all the views with which he has to deal, and he finds that this is the existence of empty space." We have only to read the texts to see that Parmenides does not first ask this, and that he is primarily interested not in empty space, but in his first lisping attempts at that dialectic of ὄν and μὴ ὄν which, continuing through Plato and Aristotle, was destined to fill so many hundreds of pages in Plotinus, Proclus, Damascius, Simplicius, and their fellows.

(3) Three famous lines apparently affirm an identity or parallelism between Thought and Being. They are:

40 τὸ γὰρ αὐτὸ νοεῖν ἐστίν τε καὶ εἶναι.
43 χρὴ τὸ λέγειν τε νοεῖν τ' ἐὸν ἔμμεναι, ἔστι γὰρ εἶναι.
94 ταὐτὸν δ' ἐστὶ νοεῖν τε καὶ οὕνεκέν ἐστι νόημα,
οὐ γὰρ ἄνευ τοῦ ἐόντος, ἐν ᾧ πεφατισμένον ἐστίν,
εὑρήσεις τὸ νοεῖν.

The chief interpretations that have been given of these lines are: (1) That Being exists only in and through Thought. (2) That the order of Thought prescribes and defines the order of Being. (3) That all that exists thinks. (4) That Non-being, and especially the void, is unthinkable. The first interpretation is that of Berkeley, who took v. 40 for the motto of his Siris. But this form of subjective idealism is foreign to the thought even of later antiquity. Plato and Aristotle stumble upon it once or twice, only to reject it.[1] There is nothing in the context to justify our attributing the doctrine to Parmenides because one or two of his lines, in literal translation, sound idealistic to modern ears. The second is a Spinozistic axiom which it would be a gross anachronism to seek in Parmenides. Early thought proceeds as if the order of ideas and the order of things were the same, but does not say so. The third interpretation, if we may trust tradition, was a real Parmenidean tenet.[2] But if he held the notion, it was rather as a part of the common hylozoistic inheritance of early Greek thought than as a fresh metaphysical paradox such as it presents itself in Plato's Parmenides.[3] And it finds expression not in the lines which we are studying, but in the famous passage which declares that it is the substance of the limbs which thinks in each and all (146–9).

This brings us to the fourth and only tenable interpretation. But even this, though recommended and necessitated by the context and tenor of the whole, can not easily be extracted from

[1] Tim. 61 C; Parmen. 132 B sqq.; Ar. Met. 1010 b, 32–35; 1047 a, 3–7.
[2] Theophr. de Sens. 3; Dox. 499: . . . ὅλως δὲ πᾶν τὸ ὂν ἔχειν τινὰ γνῶσιν.
[3] 132 C: ἢ δοκεῖν σοι ἐκ νοημάτων ἕκαστον εἶναι καὶ πάντα νοεῖν;

Digitized by Google

a literal version. Line 40 is quoted in disconnection by Clemens and Plotinus. Assuming its connection with line 39: *οὐτε γὰρ ἂν γνοίης τό γε μὴ ἐὸν*, etc., Zeller's version gives the required logical sequence: "denn dasselbe kann gedacht werden und sein," i. e. "nur das was sein kann lässt sich denken." Diels renders: "denn [das Seiende] denken und sein ist dasselbe," which is harder to interpret than the original. He probably did not intend it to mean either *cogito ergo sum* or that all Being thinks; but it is not easy to see what other interpretation his German will bear. The best solution of the problem is to translate simply with Tannery: "car le pensé et l'être sont la même chose," but to take this simple translation in the sense expressed by Zeller's version. 'Thought and Being are the same' is simply a helpless way of saying that only Being is thinkable, and Non-being is inconceivable. The other two passages must be interpreted in the same way, and, discarding all subtleties of exegesis, we must regard them as mere repetitions of this favorite notion. The literal translation of 43 is correctly given by Diels: "Das Sagen und Denken muss ein Seiendes sein. Denn das Sein existirt." But the meaning, rightly given by Simplicius, is merely that which we have already found in l. 40.[1] It is plainly not (what the words, taken literally, seem to say) that Thought and Speech are themselves *ὄντα*-entities.[2] This idea we find suggested in Plato's Sophist, 244 C. It is familiar Stoic doctrine. But it would be highly irrational to obtrude it as an irrelevant subtlety upon Parmenides. The renderings of Tannery and Burnet can not be found in the Greek. "Il faut penser et dire que ce qui est est." 'It needs must be that what can be thought and spoken of is.' Similarly in the third passage we must not press *οὕνεκα* or seek far-fetched interpretations of *πεφατισμένον*. Thought and its object are the same in the sense that every thought is of an object which is, and is a definite subject of predication, and there is no thought of that which is not. *οὕνεκέν ἐστι νόημα* is an odd phrase for that of which thought is. But Diels' 'Gedankens Ziel' and Simplicius' *τέλος ὂν αὐτοῦ* introduce misleading conceptions. Patin extracts from them the un-Parmenidean subtlety "Wenn der Gedanke dem Sein entspricht als dessen notwendige Folge, so muss das Sein zusammenhängen, sofern es nur zusammenhängend gedacht werden kann." Equally fantastic are the interpretations that have been put upon *πεφατισμένον*—Stein's anagram *ἐὸν = νοεν*, Burnet's 'betrothed,' Diels' reflections on the identification of the true name with the thing by the primitive mind, and Patin's reference of it to Parmenides' discovery that the Greek language had no direct expression for the negative which is thereby proved unreal. The only probable interpretation, if the text is sound, is that Thought

[1] Phys. 86, 29: *εἰ οὖν ὅπερ ἂν τις ἢ εἴπῃ ἢ νοήσῃ τὸ ὂν ἔστι.*

[2] Bäumker, Einheit des Parmen. Seienden, renders: "(auch) das Denken ist sein," but his discussion seems to show that he does not mean it.

Digitized by Google

is always of something (since it can't be of nothing) in and of which it is spoken.

We come now to the main argument of Patin's book (partly anticipated in the preceding discussion), the alleged polemical reference of Parmenides to Heraclitus. The external evidence has been summed up by Zeller, who makes it probable that Heraclitus' book was published too late to be used by Parmenides. Tannery agrees with Zeller that there is nothing in the text which requires us to reject the presumption thus established. Diels, who disputes Zeller's dates, and Patin, on the other hand, detect fifteen or twenty distinct allusions in the course of 150 lines. What is the evidence? To begin with, the fundamental antithesis between the two is older than either of them. The conception of the world as an everlasting process is virtually complete in Anaximander and Anaximenes. The opposite conception of an all-embracing unity that abides unaltered had been clearly suggested by Xenophanes, whatever view we take of the precise extent of his influence on Parmenides. We may disregard, then, all parallels that are deducible, as a matter of course, from this fundamental opposition. Patin takes 61: *οὐδὲ ποτ' ἦν οὐδ' ἔσται, ἐπεὶ νῦν ἔστιν ὁμοῦ πᾶν*, as a direct citation of Her. fr. 20: *ἀλλ' ἦν ἀεὶ καὶ ἔστι καὶ ἔσται*, and adds that the doctrine of an eternal present could be formulated only in antithesis to a doctrine of an eternal succession. But what is Anaximander's *γεννᾶσθαι ἀπείρους κόσμους καὶ πάλιν φθείρεσθαι εἰς τὸ ἐξ οὗ γίγνεσθαι*, and what Xenophanes' *αἰεὶ δ' ἐν ταύτῳ τε μένειν κινούμενον οὐδέν*, but an expression of precisely this antithesis? The rhetorical repetition of the parts of the verb *εἶναι* is a trick that men once alive to rhetoric may be trusted to invent for themselves. The further argument that many of the predicates of Parmenides' Being are inconsistent with his own doctrine and explicable only as polemical allusions, rests on false subtleties. *οὖλον* must be a reference to Heraclitus' *οὖλα οὐχὶ οὖλα*, because whole implies parts, and Parmenides having done away with the notion of parts, could not call Being a whole. Truly, it is a terrible thing for an interpreter of the Pre-Socratics to have read Plato's Parmenides.[1] As Pater says, the philosophic mind will never be quite sane again. Undoubtedly, as Plato shows, the poetical predicates which the Mystic applies to the Absolute imply the predicates which he rejects. But no monist or professor of the negative theology was ever checked by such considerations. For the rest Xenophanes also uses *οὖλος* of his deity. Precisely similar is Patin's argument against reading *ἐκ μὴ ἐόντος γίγνεσθαί τι παρ' αὐτό* (68–9). Such an expression would be un-Parmenidean, he says, because it not only posits *μὴ ὄν*, but assigns quality and place to it. Undoubtedly Plato showed in the Parmenides and Sophist that if you speak of *μὴ ὄν* at all, you must by implication attach many predicates to it. But a criticism which rejects Par-

[1] 137 C.

Digitized by Google

menides' expression on this ground would also prove conclusively that Herbert Spencer could not have spelled The Unknowable with a capital letter, thereby implying that we do know it to deserve reverence. Of the same character are the inconsistencies which Patin finds in *μουνογενές* and *ξυνεχές*. *ἠδ' ἀτέλεστον* (60) he takes as affirming that unity, since it already exists, is not consummated in past or future cycles by the Heraclitean *ἐκπύρωσις*. It would appear that Parmenides' Greek resembles Turkish as interpreted to Monsieur Jourdain: "Elle dit beaucoup en peu de paroles." There is a real difficulty here. The Homeric meaning hardly fits. Brandis violently reads *οὐδ' ἀτέλεστον*. Zeller and Diels follow Simplicius in taking it = *ἄπαυστον*, which, as Diels points out, requires us to assume that the poet arbitrarily uses *ἀτέλεστον* for endless in time and *ἀτελεύτητον* for endless in space. But however this may be, the reference to Heraclitus is fanciful. Patin further argues that the order in which the qualities of Being are proved in lines 62 sqq. varies from the order of their preliminary enumeration in lines 59–60 in such wise as to indicate planetary perturbation by the neighborhood of Heraclitus. This, of course, assumes two things: first, that when a poet develops a series of epithets summed up in an anticipatory line, he is bound to follow precisely the original order which may have been dictated in part by metrical convenience; second, that we possess a complete consecutive text. Not being able to accept either of these postulates, I must regard Patin's argument as entirely fantastic. In the preliminary statement *οὖλον* immediately follows *ἀγένητον* and *ἀνώλεθρον*. In the proof it is placed last—78: *οὐδὲ διαίρετόν ἐστι*—and joined with *ξυνεχές*. Patin's explanation is that in working out the proof Parmenides found it convenient to dispose his arguments in two symmetrical antithetic groups relating (1) to time and (2) to space. Parmenides, however, did not, after completing the proofs, change the order of the preliminary enumeration to conform to it, because his sentiment of the 'Historic-genetic' was so profound that he chose rather to leave the epithets in the order (1) of the points common to himself and Heraclitus, (2) in that of Heraclitus' own development of the doctrine to be refuted. Now *ἀτέλεστον*, as we have seen, denies the *ἐκπύρωσις*. But in Heraclitus' system *ἦν* or *ἔσται* would be true of the one only in retrospective or prospective reference to the *ἐκπύρωσις*. Hence in the polemical enumeration *οὐδέ ποτ' ἦν οὐδ' ἔσται* must follow *ἀτέλεστον*. But in the proof *ἀτελεύτητον* = *ἀτέλεστον* comes last.

Further references to Heraclitus are detected in the detail of the special arguments. In the *Δίκη* of l. 70, which does not permit the wrong of separate finite existence at all, he finds an evolution from the laxer *Δίκη* of Anaximander, which inflicts late punishment on individual existence, and that of Heraclitus, which suffers it but punishes it at once, "wie die philosophiegeschichtliche Forschung bisher kaum in einem zweiten Falle sie erreicht

Digitized by Google

hat." In γένεσις ἀπέσβεσται, 77, he sees a delicate allusion to Heraclitus' ἀποσβεννύμενον μάτρα; in οὐδὲ διαίρετον a hint of Her. fr. 2, διαιρέων κατὰ φύσιν; in ξυνόν δὲ μοι εἴη, which he would place after 86 or 88, a reference to Her. fr. 70, ξυνὸν ἀρχὴ καὶ πέρας; in λεῦσσε δ' ὅμως ἀπεόντα νόῳ παρεόντα βεβαίως (90), an imitation of the rhetorical art of παρεόντας ἀπεῖναι; in οὐ γὰρ ἄνευ τοῦ ἐόντος . . . εὑρήσεις τὸ νοεῖν (95), a polemic against Heraclitus' σοφὸν κεχωρισμένον πάντων, as in οὔτε σκιδνάμενον—οὔτε συνιστάμενον (92), more plausibly with Diels against Her. 40, σκίδνησι καὶ συνάγει.

There is space for but one or two further illustrations outside of the main argument. In line 14: Δίκη . . . ἔχει κληῖδας ἀμοιβούς, he sees an allusion to the alternations of the light and dark power. He might better seek a parallel in Shakspere's "corresponsive and fulfilling bolts." More serious consideration is required by lines 46–51:

> αὐτὰρ ἔπειτ' ἀπὸ τῆς, ἣν δὴ βροτοὶ εἰδότες οὐδέν
> πλάττονται, δίκρανοι· ἀμηχανίη γὰρ ἐν αὐτῶν
> στήθεσιν ἰθύνει πλακτὸν νόον· οἱ δὲ φοροῦνται
> κωφοὶ ὁμῶς τυφλοί τε, τεθηπότες, ἄκριτα φῦλα,
> οἷς τὸ πέλειν τε καὶ οὐκ εἶναι ταὐτὸν νενόμισται
> κοὐ ταὐτόν, πάντων δὲ παλίντροπός ἐστι κέλευθος.

Taken as a whole, this passage certainly reads like a diatribe against the philosophy of Heraclitus, but the specific allusions which Patin finds in it will not endure criticism. Purely fanciful are the arguments based on the general, denunciatory tone, the suggestions of πλάττονται, and πλακτόν, the distinction between αὐτῶν and the νόος ἐν στήθεσιν (regarded as a separable λόγος), and the paradoxical antithesis which he sees in ἰθύνει and φοροῦνται. All the contemporary philosophers and logographers made a point of denouncing the blindness and folly of the multitude and affirmed that the 'Greeks' talked foolishness. πλακτός is the natural word for such going astray, and can not be pressed into an allusion to the flux. And nothing can be extracted from such simple, conventional expressions as ἰθύνει and νόον ἐν στήθεσι. οἱ δὲ φοροῦνται, which Diels and Patin, after Bernays and Schwegler, take to be a sarcastic allusion to the flux in the vein of Plato's ἀτεχνῶς κατὰ τὰ συγγράμματα φέρονται, is rather in the tone of Empedocles' πάντοσ' ἐλαυνόμενος, and in any case is a mere verse-ending; cf. Emped. 411, and φέρονται, Il. XV 628. The case must rest on lines 50 and 51. It is clear that Heraclitus might be meant by 'those to whom being and not being are the same and yet not the same.' Zeller objects that Heraclitus did not say this in terms. But the λόγος λέγων πάντα εἶναι καὶ μὴ εἶναι (Ar. Met. 1012a24) is near enough to it for controversial purposes. But that the reference may be to Heraclitus does not prove that it must be to him. Patin virtually abandons the whole case when he admits that Parmenides believed the multitude to be of the school of the Ephesian, and that he directed his polemic against the

Digitized by Google

"Heracleitisiren der Menge." And the general tone is that of a prophet rebuking a perverse generation rather than of a scholastic polemic against an individual.

Lastly, both Patin and Diels take the *πάντων δὲ παλίντροπός ἐστι κέλευθος* as a distinct reference to the *παλίντροπος ἁρμονίη* or to the *ὁδὸς ἄνω κάτω*. But (1) this involves an extremely harsh construction: we must repeat in thought *οἷς* and render 'in whose opinion there is a *παλίντροπος κέλευθος* of all things.' The more natural construction and meaning are that they are all astray, all on the wrong or self-contradictory path. Cf. *ὁδοί* (34), *κέλευθος* (36), *ἀταρπόν* (38),[1] *ὁδοῦ* (45), *ὁδοῖο* (57), "onde la traccia vostra è for di strada" (Dante, Purg. 8 *in fine*). (2) *παλίντροπος*, as Zeller observes, is not the only reading in Heraclitus, and in any case is not so strange a word that its nearly contemporary use implies borrowing.

The parallel *κρῖναι δὲ λόγῳ*, which Patin thinks is a scornful echo of Heraclitus' *λόγος*, raises a general question. At a certain stage of reflection it is inevitable that the philosopher should appeal to *λόγος* or *νόος* against the superficial testimony of the senses. Heraclitus, Parmenides, Empedocles, Anaxagoras and Democritus all do so, though, in the opinion of Plato and Aristotle, they have no right to use this criterion, since they do not distinguish sense-perception and thought. We possess almost no texts of any philosopher before Heraclitus, and he happens to be the first to express the idea. Must we say that all the others borrowed it of him? A similar question arises with regard to another group of parallels common to Diels and Patin most of which have already been cited. Norden has recently pointed out that Heraclitus and Empedocles offer the earliest good examples of the Gorgian figures. Diels and Patin are inclined to attribute to direct imitation of Heraclitus all early use of such rhetorical figures as occur first in him. Thus Diels, in an interesting note on *διὰ παντὸς πάντα περῶντα* (32), points out that this *παρήχησις* of *πᾶν*, so common in Plato, is not found in the drama or in early poetry. It occurs in Her. fr. 19: *κυβερνῆσαι πάντα διὰ πάντων*. Hence Diels infers that Parmenides and Empedocles learned it from Heraclitus. The case is similar with *παρεόντα ἀπεόντα* (supra, p. 214) and, according to Patin, with *καὶ πᾶσιν καὶ παντὶ* (150), *δοκοῦντα δοκίμως* (32), *ἦν—ἔσται* (supra, p. 212). I can not accept this reasoning. The pointed antithetical phrase of Heraclitus doubtless exercised considerable influence on the development of 5th-century rhetoric. It is interesting to note that he first used the *παρήχησις* of *πᾶν*. But it is impossible to believe that no Greek could have employed so simple a device in the years 480–440, except as a lesson learned from him.

[1] Patin, p. 517, tries to distinguish this as an utterly abandoned, narrow path from *κέλευθος* above. But it is merely a convenient synonym. Cf. Emped. 405: *ὅπῃ πρὸς κέρδος ἀταρπός*.

Digitized by Google

I have neither space nor inclination to repeat the details of Patin's reconstruction of the "Welt und Zonen System." It is no better and no worse than Burnet's annular earth, Tannery's whorls borrowed from the myth of Er, or the complication of wheels and cylinders which Neuhauser discovers in Anaximander. Patin makes the universe a sphere, of which the earth is the lower segment. The outer periphery is the *πάγος περιέχον*, the aether is the upper segment, and the other *στεφάναι* are intermediate bands or zones on the sphere. He justifies the strange shape which he assigns to the earth by the word *στρογγύλος*, which is used by Diogenes Laertius in the passage (8, 48) where he discusses the claims of Pythagoras and Parmenides to priority in attributing the round shape to the earth. Patin thinks *στρογγύλος* means "ein Körper dessen Wölbung durch eine Ebene abgeschnitten wird." This was not Plato's opinion, Parmen. 137 E: *στρογγύλον γέ που ἐστι τοῦτο οὗ ἂν τὰ ἔσχατα πανταχῇ ἀπὸ τοῦ μέσου ἴσον ἀπέχῃ.*

PAUL SHOREY.

Digitized by Google

REPORTS.

REVUE DE PHILOLOGIE, Vol. XXIII.

No. 1.

1. Pp. 1–36. The Temple of Didymean Apollo (third article), with an appendix on the door of the θόλος at Epidaurus, and on the passage of Vitruvius (IV 6) concerning doors or gates, by B. Haussoullier. This article is very interesting, especially to archaeologists, but can not be made intelligible in a brief *précis*.

2. Pp. 37–50. Valerius Flaccus and the Barbarians, by René Harmand. The effect of this searching article is to place Valerius Flaccus on a higher pedestal.

3. Pp. 50–52. Ad Inscript. Gr. Insul Maris Aegaei, III 331, by Ch. Michel.

4. P. 52. In Cic. Fin. 2, 15, Louis Havet finds a quotation from Lucilius.

5. Pp. 53–67. Critical notes on the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark (16 passages), by Joseph Viteau.

6. Pp. 68–79. The Saturnian Verse, by Henri Bornecque. The author disregards totally the accentual theory. He examines the ancient treatment of the verse, and all the extant examples. He emends a few, rejects a few, and adds a few. His conclusions are as follows: 1. The Saturnian is composed of six feet and a long syllable over; it is an iambic septenarius catalectic. The pure foot is the fifth. The first foot may be an iambus, tribrach, spondee, or anapaest; the second, an iambus, spondee, or anapaest; the third, a pyrrhic (as iambus), iambus, tribrach, or spondee or its substitutes; the fourth, an iambus, spondee, or dactyl; the fifth, an iambus only; the sixth as the third. 2. The separations between words cut the verse into four parts: first and second feet, third foot and first half of fourth, second half of fourth and whole of fifth, end of verse. Between these different members hiatus is allowed, and the last syllable of each is *anceps*. The invariable main caesura is hepthemimeral; the other two caesuras may, in case of necessity (as in dealing with proper names) be displaced a half-foot. 3. The third and fourth half-feet, as also the eighth and ninth (that is, the last syllables of the first and third members), may be replaced by a protracted long syllable, and even a short (being here in the place of an *anceps*) may be

Digitized by Google

thus prolonged. The same liberty is allowed the twelfth and thirteenth half-feet, but only when it is necessary for the verse to end with a spondaic word.

7. Pp. 80–87. A list of Milesian Metoecs, by B. Haussoullier. The author makes it almost certain that Miletus should be added to the list of cities that had metoecs, and produces an inscription containing a considerable list of them.

8. Pp. 88–104. Book Notices. 1) Mélanges Henri Weil; Paris, 1898. B. H. classifies (without reviewing) the thirty-nine articles of this volume dedicated to Henri Weil on the completion of the eightieth year of his life. He then makes some highly eulogistic remarks concerning the great philologian and his amazing activity. 2) Homère, étude historique et critique par Victor Terret; Paris, 1899. Unfavorably mentioned by Albert Martin. Terret holds that one and the same Homer composed both the Iliad and the Odyssey, that every episode is genuine, that there are no inconsistencies—in short, that every difficulty can be easily explained away. 3) Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, VIII. The Five Post-Kleisthenean Tribes, by Fred Orlando Bates; Macmillan, 1898. Very favorably noticed by Albert Martin. 4) Thucydidis Historiae ad optimos codices ab ipso collatis [sic]. Recensuit Dr. Carolus Hude. Tomus prior, libri I–IV. Leipzig, 1898. Albert Martin gives a brief review and concludes: the author has not shown enough critical spirit; but the edition marks an important advance. 5) W. Warren, A Study of Conjunctional Temporal Clauses in Thucydides; Berlin, 1898. This Bryn Mawr doctor-dissertation E. Chambry finds very meritorious, though it produces no important new facts. He commends some new interpretations and conjectures. He takes the author to be a man. 6) C. L. Jungius, De vocabulis antiquae comoediae Atticae quae apud solos comicos aut omnino inveniuntur aut peculiari notione praedita occurrunt; Amsterdam, 1897. Albert Martin finds much to condemn in this work, and nothing to commend. He enumerates many faults. 7) Extraits des orateurs attiques, texte grec publié avec une introduction, des éclaircissements historiques, un index et des notes, par Louis Bodin; Paris, 1898. B. Haussoullier reviews this work very favorably, but notices some slight faults. 8) Die Attische Beredsamkeit. Dritte Abtheilung, zweiter Abschnitt: Demosthenes' Genossen und Gegner. Dargestellt von Friedrich Blass; Leipzig, 1898. (Second edition.) Briefly but favorably noticed by Albert Martin. 9) W. M. Lindsay, Introduction à la critique des textes latins basée sur le texte de Plaute, traduite par J.-P. Waltzing; Paris, 1898. Georges Ramain finds this book useful, not only for students but for some teachers. He thinks there should have been a chapter on the necessity of understanding a text perfectly before attempting to emend it. 10) M. Tullii Ciceronis pro T. Annio Milone oratio ad iudices. Texte latin revu, corrigé et

Digitized by Google

annoté par J. et A. Wagener. 3e édition; Bruxelles, 1898. J. Lebreton considers this a good work marred by the absence of an index, by references to books inaccessible to students, etc. 11) M. Tulli Ciceronis Cato maior de senectute, with notes by Charles E. Bennett; New York, 1897. Also M. Tulli Ciceronis Laelius de amicitia, by the same author. Briefly but favorably mentioned by Philippe Fabia. 12) Ausgewählte Briefe von M. Tullius Cicero, erklärt von Friedrich Hofmann. Erstes Bändchen, siebente Auflage, besorgt von F. Sternkopf; Berlin, 1898. J. Lebreton commends this work highly, finding only a few insignificant faults. 13) Letters of Cicero to Atticus, Book II, with introduction, notes and appendices, ed. by Alfred Pretor; Cambridge, 1898. Briefly and not very favorably mentioned by J. Lebreton. 14) Gai Iuli Caesaris de Bello Gallico, Liber II, edited with notes and vocabulary for beginners by E. S. Shuckburgh; Cambridge, 1897. Briefly and in the main favorably mentioned by E. Chambry. 15) Cornelius Nepos, Timotheus Phocion Agesilaus Epaminondas Pelopidas Timoleon Eumenes Datames Hamilcar, edited with notes and vocabulary for beginners by E. S. Shuckburgh; Cambridge, 1897. Briefly but very favorably noticed by E. C. 16) Columba (G. M.), Un codice interpolato di Tibullo (extract from the Rassegna di antichità classica, 1898, pp. 65–80). Georges Lafaye expresses the opinion that the author places too high a value upon this MS. 17) Thomas (Paul), Corrections au texte des Lettres de Sénèque à Lucilius, 2e série (extraits des Bulletins de l'Académie royale de Belgique, 3e série, t. XXXV, No. 3); Bruxelles, 1898. Georges Lafaye, in a favorable notice, enumerates the most important corrections proposed. 18) Mario Margaritori, Petronio Arbitro. Ricerche biographiche. Vercelli, 1897. Philippe Fabia says: "Cette étude, solide, claire, ingénieuse, agréable, eût encore gagné à être écrite en un langage moins prolixe et plus simple." 19) Felice Ramorino, Cornelio Tacito nella storia della coltura; Milano, 1898. Philippe Fabia finds this attempt to do for Tacitus what Zielinski has done for Cicero, not altogether successful. 20) Tacitus Germania, erklärt von U. Zernial. Zweite Auflage; Berlin, 1897. Ph. F. briefly notices this as an improvement on an already excellent work. 21) Carlo Pascal, Studi romani. III, L'esilio di Scipione Africano Maggiore; IV, Il partito dei Gracchi e Scipione Emiliano; Torino, 1896. Philippe Fabia sums up: "L'information est complète, l'argumentation ingénieuse, l'exposition claire; les résultats sont seulement plausibles." 22) J.-P. Waltzing, Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains, t. III, 1899, Louvain. F. C. considers this a useful work for historians and jurists. 23) M. J. Toutain, L'inscription d'Henchir Mettich. Un nouveau document sur la propriété agricole dans l'Afrique romaine; Paris, 1897. Philippe Fabia considers this an important inscription well edited, and bestows very high praise on the editor.

Digitized by Google

No. 2.

1. Pp. 105–11. Demosthenes and the Thessalian Hieromnemones, by Paul Foucart. This learned and interesting article is practically a defence of the Thessalian Hieromnemones, especially Daodochus, against the charge of treason preferred by Demosthenes (De Cor. 211).

2. Pp. 112–16. The lamp race, by Paul Foucart, with incidental interpretation of Aesch. Ag. 305, where ὁ πρῶτος καὶ τελευταῖος is one man.

3. Pp. 117–25. Critical notes on eleven passages of Cic. Fin., by Louis Havet.

4. Pp. 126–9. Discussion of Orphica, Frag. 208 (Abel), by Paul Tannery.

5. Pp. 130 f. Discussion of Ter. Phorm. V 12–21, by Georges Ramain.

6. Pp. 132–40. L. Laloy discusses the question: "What are the chords mentioned in the Περὶ Μουσικῆς, ch. XIX?"

7. P. 140. Plaut. Cas. 72 emended by Louis Havet.

8. Pp. 141–6. Critical notes on half a dozen passages of Tacitus, by Léopold Constans.

9. Pp. 147–64. Caligula and the temple of Didymean Apollo, by B. Haussoullier. This interesting article seems to terminate (so far as the Rev. d. Phil. is concerned) the series of acute investigations of M. Haussoullier into the history of this temple. Previous articles traced the progress of construction from year to year; the present article brings its history down to the point where Christianity began to revolutionize the world, and the history of Greek temples and festivals and oracles enters upon a new epoch. The article gives an account of the self-deification of Caligula in Asia, with the demand for a temple at Miletus and the order for the building of said temple to the new god—at the expense of the province. The provincials wisely decided to make an Apollo of him and so utilize this nearly completed temple; but the taking off of the god put an end to further work upon it. This and the previous articles constitute a model of acute historical investigation.

10. Pp. 165–8. A list of debtors to the treasury at Ilium, by B. Haussoullier.

11. Pp. 169–84. Fragments of Antejustinian law from a palimpsest of Autun, by Émile Chatelain. (To be continued.)

12. P. 185. The editors announce the death of Éduard Tournier.

13. Pp. 185–90. Book Notices. 1) H. Omont, Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque nationale et

Digitized by Google

des autres Bibliothèques de Paris et des départements, 4e vol. Paris. C. E. R. gives the contents of this last volume of Omont's important and valuable work. 2) Rivista bibliografica dell' Archivio giuridico "Filippo Serafini." Direttore, E. Serafini, Modena, 1899, vol. I, No. 1. B. Haussoullier directs attention to this periodical as not neglecting Greek law. 3) Ch. E. Bennett, Critique of Some Recent Subjunctive Theories; New York, 1898. J. Lebreton agrees in the main with Bennett as against Elmer. 4) Albert Martin notices briefly Velsen's Aristophanis Equites revised by Zacher (Leipzig, 1897); Zacher's Aristophanesstudien, erstes Heft (1898); Herwerden's Ἀριστοφάνους Εἰρήνη (Leyden, 1897); Kock's Frösche des Aristophanes, fourth edition (Berlin, 1898); Graves's Clouds of Aristophanes (Cambridge, 1898). 5) E. Ardaillon, Les mines du Laurion dans l'antiquité; Paris, 1897. This "thèse française" of 218 pages is highly praised by A. M. 6) Léon Halkin, Les esclaves publics chez les Romains; Bruxelles, 1897. Commended by Philippe Fabia.

No. 3.

1. Pp. 193–225. Glossarium sive vocabularium ad oracula chaldaica a clerico post Patricium et Stanleium sub falso nomine oraculorum Zoroastris mendose edita, nunc vero fontium ope correcta, confecit Albertus Jahnius, Dr. Phil. H. C., Prof. Hon. in Univ. Litt. Bernensi, etc. This is not merely an article on the vocabulary, but the vocabulary itself is published in full.

2. Pp. 226–8. Léopold Constans emends four passages of Caes. De Bell. Gal.

3. Pp. 229–31. Λύσις προγόνων ἀθεμίστων, by Salomon Reinach. This is a reply to Tannery's article (pp. 126–9), which was itself a criticism of an unpublished lecture of Reinach. The point in dispute is whether the expression cited refers to the expiation of inherited guilt, or of the sins of ancestors (lit. sinful ancestors). Reinach maintains the latter view, which he defends with strong arguments. The question is discussed whether praying for the dead in the Catholic Church and the apostolic baptizing for the dead are not due to Orphic influence.

4. Pp. 232–7. On Verg. Georg. I 489–492, by A. Cartault. The whole difficulty, so far as Vergil is concerned, is removed when we consider the fact that there were *two* battles at Philippi (hence *iterum*). In the first, the wing commanded by Cassius was defeated, and he slew himself. A month later Brutus fought again, was defeated, and took his own life. Later writers confounded Philippi and Pharsalus, and possibly the misinterpretation of the above-cited passage of Vergil contributed to this error.

5. Pp. 238–48. The ancient enharmonic gamuts, by Louis Laloy.

Digitized by Google

6. Pp. 249–53. Hor. Epod. 9, 19–20. An ingenious explanation of the vexatious *sinistrorsum citae*, by A. Cartault.

7. Pp. 254–69. Στρατηγὸς ὕπατος, Στρατηγὸς ἀνθύπατος, by Paul Foucart. This interesting article demonstrates that the Roman government, when communicating with Greeks, and Greeks when composing documents of their own, prefixed στρατηγός to ὕπατος (consul) and ἀνθύπατος (proconsul), until Greece became a Roman province.

8. Pp. 270–73. A unique case of guarantee, by T. W. Beasley. An interesting discussion of Pseudo-Aristotle, περὶ θαυμασίων ἀκουσμάτων, 834*b*, 7, relating to the use of the fountain at Palici in Sicily to decide whether an oath is true or false.

9. Pp. 274–92. Inscriptions of Heraclea in Patmos, by B. Haussoullier.

10. Pp. 293–9. A new milestone bearing the name of Manius Aquillius, by B. Haussoullier.

No. 4.

1. Pp. 301–12. Did Persius attack Nero? E. Haguenin discusses this question with great ability, arriving at the conclusion that he may possibly have reflected upon him as a poet, but almost certainly did not attack him in any other way.

2. Pp. 313–20. Notes on Milesian inscriptions: θυορία, θεωρία, θεορία, by B. Haussoullier.

3. Pp. 321–32. Critical discussion of eleven passages of Cic. Fin., by Louis Havet.

4. Pp. 332 f. Isidore Lévy maintains that Πελασγοί are simply 'ancients,' lit. 'gray-(haired).'

5. Pp. 334–42. Metrical prose and the Dialogus de Oratoribus, by Henri Bornecque. The examination of this work from the rhythmical standpoint tends to strengthen the theory that Tacitus was the author, and makes it probable that the work appeared before the Agricola and the Germania (A. D. 98).

6. Pp. 343–6. Book Notices. 1) L'Astrologie grecque, par A. Bouché-Leclercq; Paris, 1899. Highly commended by C. E. R. The work is indispensable for those interested in the subject. 2) Paul Le Breton, Quelques observations sur l'Aulularia de Plaute; Paris, 1898. According to Georges Ramain, Part I, on the use of *hic*, *ille*, *iste*, etc., is original and instructive, but a little over-done; Part II contains some conjectures chiefly sound. 3) Ausgewählte Komödien des Terentius Afer, erklärt von K. Dziatzko. Erstes Bändchen: Phormio. Dritte veränderte Auflage bearbeitet von Dr. E. Hauler; Leipzig, 1898. Georges Ramain finds the emendations generally good and the commentary excellent. 4) Luigi Borsari, Topografia di Roma antica, con

Digitized by Google

7 tavole; Milano, 1897. Aug. Audollent commends this work as filling a gap, and being in every way excellent.

The Revue des Revues, begun in No. 2 and continued in No. 3, is completed in this number.

MILTON W. HUMPHREYS.

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN. Herausgegeben von Dr. EUGEN KÖLBING. Leipzig, XXIV. Band, 1898.[1]

I.—K. Horst, Contributions to the Study of the Old English Annals. This study deals with the classification of MSS, and was written independently of Kupferschmidt's treatment of the same subject in Englische Studien, XIII. The results on the whole differ but slightly from those of Kupferschmidt.

A. E. H. Swaen, Figures of Imprecation. This article is continued in the second number of the volume, but for the sake of convenience the two installments are here summarized together. Swaen's treatment is historical, and traces the development of asseverations through the Middle English period to the present. It is reinforced with abundant and carefully classified citations from Middle English literature and the early drama, and from the novels and periodicals of later date, together with interesting parallels in other languages, principally the Dutch. An artificial distinction is observed between real oaths, which invoke the Deity, the Saints, or anv other object of reverence, and quasi-oaths, such as 'Faith,' 'By this light,' etc. The oath belongs to the vocabulary of the uncultured, and furnishes them with a convenient substitute for the emphasis of speech which greater refinement and closer acquaintance with their mother-tongue would have given them. There is a marked tendency toward corruption of oaths, due, no doubt, to euphemistic influence. Swearing by the Virgin, the Saints, and the Mass ceased with the Reformation, and most of the other forms cited have become obsolete or local.

J. Ellinger, Contributions to English Grammar. The first note discusses the verbal auxiliary *do*, of whose use the language contains traces from Old English times. However, it has been greatly extended since 1700, though certain common verbs which frequently occur in negative statements or questions expecting positive answers show a tendency to resist the usage. Other notes deal with the repetition of the subject, as in *He is a good youth, this Hero*; the predicate nominative with *stand, come, go*; the reflexive with *rest, sit, remember, repent*; the pure infinitive

[1] In the last report the date of vol. XXIII should have been 1897 instead of 1896.

Digitized by Google

with *help*; the prepositional infinitive with *need, bid*; the word-order in the use of *enough*, and of the indefinite article with an adjective and *too* or *quite*. The article is a continuation of a study in Englische Studien, XX.

Reviews.—Kluge, in a notice of W. Vietor's Die Northumbrischen Runensteine, makes a plea for a well-edited *corpus* of runic inscriptions in England and Scotland. Vietor's critical and grammatical treatment of his subject is an important step in that direction.—J. T. T. Brown in his discussion of Authorship of the Kingis Quair concludes that the author was not James I of Scotland, but an obscure poet whose name has not been handed down. Kaluza, in his review of the book, says that Brown has gone too far in his attempt to invalidate the testimony of the scribe and the historian Major, nor could it be true, as Brown asserts, that the king would have forgotten, during his retention in England, the dialect of his early life. The chief argument, however, is based on the relation of the poem to the Court of Love. By showing that the latter is not merely the predecessor, but in some instances the original of the Kingis Quair, Brown seeks a date of composition later than the time of James. The evidence is worthless because it was collected in comparative ignorance of the literature of the 14th and 15th centuries, and without allowance for the large element common to the poetry of the period.—M. Liddell criticizes severely Flügel's Neuenglisches Lesebuch for its lack of method and aim. The volume illustrates the period of Henry VIII, and is the first of a series which is to cover the Modern English period.—E. Koeppel praises E. Meyer's book on Machiavelli and the Elizabethan Drama for its thoroughness. The discussion is carried down to 1664, and yields the interesting fact that the Elizabethans learned more of Machiavelli through the French polemic of Gentillet against the Italian statesman, published in 1576, and translated into English in 1577, than at first-hand from his works. Meyer thinks Shakespeare got his knowledge of Machiavelli from Marlowe and the historians, but the reviewer believes that in Hamlet the speeches of Claudius point to a direct use of Machiavelli's works by Shakespeare. Several passages are cited by way of evidence.—W. W. Skeat's A Student's Pastime (a reprint of articles selected from Notes and Queries) is reviewed by L. Türkheim. Skeat has been a pioneer in support of a more scientific and less fanciful method of studying English etymology. Furthermore, he has protested against the conservatism of his countrymen in remaining so exclusively devoted to the classics, and in allowing English scholarship to pass into the hands of foreigners. The present book in effect reasserts his position.—Gustaf Steffen's Aus dem Modernen England and C. Klöpper's Englisches Real-Lexicon are both reviewed by H. Klinghardt with reference to their value in the reformed study of modern languages. By the newer definition the subject includes not merely the language, but the people who speak it, and the land in which they live.

Digitized by Google

Miscellanea.—Sarrazin contributes a note on Rolf Krake and his relation to the Beowulf, Kölbing a few emendations and notes on the text of Ywain and Gawain, and Stoffel several illustrations of the meaning and origin of 'gooseberry-picker' (Century Dict., s. v.).—P. van Draat discusses a meaning of 'any' not mentioned in the New English Dictionary. 'The word "any" prefixed to a substantive—especially a substantive expressing time, number, amount, quantity—often imparts to it an intensive meaning.' The use is illustrated in 'the only remaining poem of *any* length.'—J. Morris offers a grammatical note, with abundant illustration, on the use of a dependent substantive in the singular, instead of the plural, which the plural of the possessor seems to require; for example, 'They pine for their *desk* and for their *study*.'

II.—G. Caro, The Variants of the Durham MS and the Tiberius Fragment of the Old English Prose Version of the Benedictine Rule and their Relation to the other MSS. In the text of the Benedictine Rule by Logemann (Early English Text Society), and that by Schröer (Grein-Wülker Bibliothek), the Durham MS was collated by means of a fairly accurate transcription. The variants in this article are based on the MS itself. In determining its relation to the other MSS Caro assumes between Z and a another source a' from which a and D are derived. In a number of cases D alone gives the correct reading. A list of D's variants is appended.

H. Lessmann, Studies in the Middle English Life of St. Cuthbert. An article under this title in vol. XXIII dealt with variant readings and the sources of the poem. The author now takes up the inflexions of those nouns and verbs whose forms clearly illustrate the Northern dialect. A few strong verbs curiously fail to make usual ablaut change in the preterit singular, possibly owing to the necessities of rime. For the same reason the dental sign of the weak preterit is often lacking. The vocabulary, containing as it does a large Scandinavian element, together with certain contractions, is distinctly Northern.

H. Klinghardt, The Value of Phonetics in Teaching the Mother-tongue and Foreign Languages. Klinghardt reports on the paper of O. Jespersen read before the Association of Danish Grammar Schools in 1895. It is a clear and intelligent exposition of the practical application of phonetics in the reformed method of elementary linguistic training. The pupil may hear the correct sound many times without being able to make it. The difficulty of imitation is almost entirely removed, however, if, by means of a simple chalk diagram, or joining of the hands, the teacher shows him the necessary position and articulation of the organs of speech. Only the simplest and most useful facts of the subject should be taught, though a knowledge of the intricacies of the vocal apparatus on the part of the teacher is desirable. Phonetics

Digitized by Google

is proving a most efficient means of correcting in the pupils the errors of pronunciation which they contract at home. In teaching foreign languages it enables pupils to master sounds which do not occur in the native speech, and which would otherwise be quite impossible for them. The first process is the mastery of the single isolated sound, and only after this is complete comes the second—namely, the attempt to join the sounds—that is, to pronounce words and read. At this point two courses are open to the instructor: he may either cause the pupils to pronounce after him a sufficient number of times given exercises of words or sentences, or he may use a simple and accurate phonetic transcription. The latter method has been slow in gaining favor, because it is feared that new difficulties are thus imposed upon the pupil. Actual experiment shows that such is not the case. By way of illustration Jespersen has drawn upon his experience in Danish schools. The article is to be concluded in a later number.

Reviews.—In a notice of Sweet's Student's Dictionary of Anglo-Saxon, Binz recommends it as being cheaper and more accurate than Hall's. It corrects errors that have become traditional among the dictionaries, and discriminates rigorously against doubtful words. Binz adds a list of words not found here or in other dictionaries, gleaned chiefly from charters and records.—O. Brenner in a review of Luick's Untersuchungen zur englischen Lautgeschichte commends the work to all students of English phonology, and praises its thoroughness. It deals principally with the phonological relations between Modern and Middle English. A slightly undue emphasis is laid upon the principle of symmetry in the development of sounds, nevertheless the author has succeeded in explaining several difficult problems.—Kölbing says of Horstmann's edition of Richard Rolle in the Library of Early English Writers, that it furnishes a good textual basis for limited researches in text-criticism. hermeneutics and lexicography.—The title of E. Gättinger's Die Lyrik Lydgate's is a misnomer in the opinion of Koeppel. It should be changed to Ueber Lydgate's Kleinere Dichtungen. The reviewer criticizes at length Gättinger's statements concerning Lydgate's relation to his sources, especially Isidore of Seville, Josephus, and Petrus Comestor, and adds remarks on the genuineness of certain poems and on emendations suggested by the author.—Glöde's review of K. M. Klassen's Ueber das Leben und die Schriften Byrhtferð's, eines angelsächsischen Gelehrten und Schriftstellers um das Jahr 1000, is merely a summary of the contents of the essay, which is, by the way, the first investigation bearing on this Old English author.—Hoops reviews G. Wenzel's Friedrich Hölderlin und John Keats als Geistesverwandte Dichter. The points of resemblance between these poets consist in their enthusiasm for nature and Greek antiquity, and especially in their worship of ideal beauty. Keats, however, is the less morose of the two, while Hölderlin possessed the more intimate knowledge of Greek life and literature.—

Digitized by Google

Several German text-books of English for German and Danish schools are reviewed, chiefly by Nader, Ellinger, and Klinghardt.

Miscellanea.—Kölbing contributes two brief notes on the Canterbury Tales, and Luick and Kaluza exchange remarks on the authorship of Fragment A of the Romaunt of the Rose, especially with reference to the northern rime *love* : *behove*, discussed by both scholars in vol. XXIII.—A new etymology of *good-bye* is suggested by W. Franz, who derives it from the expression *God buy you*—that is, *God redeem you*. Several instances of this form of greeting occur in the early writers.

III.—O. Bischoff, On the Disyllabic Thesis and the Epic Caesura in Chaucer. The present installment is a discussion of the disyllabic thesis in Chaucer's heroic verse, as a prerequisite to a study of his use of the epic caesura. After an irrelevant preface Bischoff says that out of Chaucer's 30.285 heroic verses there are only 12 in which the disyllabic thesis can not be avoided by slurring, elision, emendation, and the like. However, such scholars as Ellis, Sweet, Schipper, Skeat, and Ten Brink have differed widely on this point. Ellis, for example, believed that Chaucer in the majority of cases intended the disyllabic thesis to be read as such. Sweet, on the other hand, would explain it away in nearly every case. Bischoff reviews and criticizes the position and examples of different writers on the subject, and proceeds to discover the rights of the case by studying the various instances in which Chaucer has chosen contracted or abbreviated forms for the purpose of avoiding two successive unstressed syllables. On the basis of such an investigation he is better able to say under what circumstances Chaucer preferred syncope or elision to the disyllabic thesis. The results show that the poet in most cases chose the former.

F. Graz, Contributions to a Critique of Rudyard Kipling. Graz suggests several reasons for Kipling's enormous popularity. The article contains nothing new.

Th. Holthausen, History of the Length of the Laboring Day in England. This brief discussion is a German translation of a paper by G. F. Steffens published in 1897, in the Göteborgs Handels- och Sjöfartstidning.

J. Schipper, The New Examination Ordinance for Teachers in the Austrian Gymnasia and Realschulen. The article is chiefly a reprint from Oesterreichische Mittelschule, vol. XI, of an address delivered before the examination-committee of Vienna. It is prefaced by a brief sketch of the evil conditions against which the recent reforms were directed.

Reviews.—The fifth edition of Zupitza's Alt- und Mittelenglisches Uebungsbuch, revised by Schipper, is increased by new material in literary history and metrics. Kölbing in his review

Digitized by Google

suggests that a specimen of the Ancren Riwle be added.—Kölbing also reviews W. E. Henley's edition of Byron and D. Englaender's study of Byron's Mazeppa. Henley has failed to take advantage of much useful illustrative material in Byron's letters.—In reference to the edition of William Knight's Poetical Works of Wordsworth, dated 1896, Schnabel criticizes the editor for arranging the poems chronologically instead of following the classified arrangement made by Wordsworth himself.

The Miscellanea include a grammatical note by Wülfing on the Old English use of *sum* with the genitive of a numeral, a note by J. N. Robinson on the Celtic versions of Sir Beuis of Hamtoun, and two notes from the literary remains of Ten Brink on the Prologue to the Canterbury Tales.

YALE UNIVERSITY. CHARLES GROSVENOR OSGOOD.

Digitized by Google

BRIEF MENTION.

In commending the edition of *Aristophanes' Peace* (Clarendon Press) with which Dr. MERRY has just enriched his well-known and popular Aristophanic series, a recent number of *The Spectator* (June 2, 1900) has furnished a *Brief Mention* ready to hand, which I might copy and pass on. 'A more competent and appreciative editor of Aristophanes could not be found. The student will not only get all the help in the way of scholarship and history that he needs, but he will be made to see all the fun.' Unfortunately, the editor of the Journal remembers very vividly the notice that *The Spectator* gave of GILDERSTENE'S *Pindar* some fourteen years ago (May 8, 1886) and also the droll apology it made for miscalling the luckless editor's name during the whole course of the long and very unsympathetic review. 'We regret the error very much,' said *The Spectator* a fortnight afterwards, 'although it is evident that the article was a study of Pindar and not of the work taken as the occasion of that study.' Perhaps in this case the notice is a study of Dr. MERRY'S reputation rather than of Dr. MERRY'S *Peace*, and as Dr. MERRY is known everywhere for his Greek scholarship and his high academic position, 'Rector of Lincoln College,' 'Public Orator of the University of Oxford,' and most successful editor of Homer, to say nothing of the repeated issues of his Aristophanic commentaries, it was easier to praise Dr. MERRY than to examine his book; and the notice seems to be a perfunctory one. At all events, *The Spectator* has got the name right this time, and, after all, the former blunder has parallels enough. A few months ago (February 19) *The Classical Review* published a notice of a dissertation by Professor JOHN ADAMS SCOTT in which the author is repeatedly called ADAMS, and I blush to say that in my notice of BIRKLEIN'S valuable study of the *Articular Infinitive*, a subject in which I took especial interest, BIRKLEIN figures as *Bicklein*, and *Bicklein* it is in the Index also. I have had to apologize for calling 'Whitelaw' 'Ridgeway' (VII 169, 170, XIV 126); I have written 'Ergoteles' when I meant 'Psaumis' and 'Adrastos' when I meant 'Amphiaraos,' so that if anybody else writes 'Akusilaos' for 'Arkesilaos,' as happened the other day, I fail to be shocked.

In the good old times when the way to the episcopate lay through Greek, the primrose path of Aristophanes answered as

Digitized by Google

well as any other, if not better; and, apart from this tradition and despite the Biblical warning and the Greek proverb μῦς πίττης γίνεται, Aristophanic pitch has a certain fascination for church mice. But Dr. MERRY does not intend to be defiled any more than is necessary, and he follows the late Rev. HUBERT A. HOLDEN in keeping within the limits of becoming mirth. True, the dung-beetle can not be ejected from the *Peace*. Else there would be no *Peace*. But may not comedy be washed in the waters of Philistia and may not the editor, his task done, cry out in the language of the *Peace* (v. 868): ἡ παῖς λέλουται καὶ τὰ τῆς πυγῆς καλά? No! he may not, for this is one of the omitted lines. But *The Spectator* tells us that the student will be 'made to see all the fun,' and this may be true, for my experience shows me that unregenerate boys are especially fond of looking up the lacunae in expurgated editions, and are not likely to miss any of the points that Dr. MERRY has sedulously broken off. However, Dr. MERRY has not been content with skipping verses. He has actually dared to alter them. The decent cretic νυμφίον has been smuggled into the place of the utterly indecent original (v. 870); but, alas! one misses the article (cf. v. 859: νυμφίον μ' ὁρᾶτε λαμπρὸν ὄντα), and as a Hellenist I should prefer βινεῖν with its right accent to πίνειν with a wrong one (v. 867). Nor has the Rector of Lincoln always been careful to wash Dame Comedy behind the ears. She is a Margery Daw and her uncleanliness is pervasive. So I find, to my astonishment, that v. 965 stands in all its shamelessness: οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδεὶς ὅστις οὐ κριθὴν ἔχει. It is a passage on which the scholiast dilates, and while I do not trust myself to quote the original Greek, I will allow myself to copy the admirable version of the verecund Dr. RUTHERFORD, whose disinfecting method I have characterized elsewhere (XIX 347). 'The aedoeon of men was called κριθή.' By the way, Dr. MERRY'S forbearance in the matter of κριθή reminds me of a gentleman who undertook to expurgate the sixth satire of Juvenal and left the *fibula* standing in vv. 73, 379. But, in my judgment, Aristophanes is not to be infibulated. Else the Muses, to quote Coleridge, would never have mistaken him 'for their own good man.'

But one of my students excused himself some years ago, on grounds of morality, from the study of the *Lysistrata*, and I will not dwell any longer on the aspect of Aristophanes which Dr. MERRY has emphasized by his expressive silence. In matters grammatical and lexical Dr. MERRY'S *Peace* presents a contrast to STARKIE'S *Wasps*, noticed some time ago (A. J. P. XIX 113), but, as I said in the last number of the Journal (p. 111), no editor is under obligation to enlarge on points of grammar and diction, and in the case of Aristophanes it would be tiresome to insist on the normality of his usage except when it is twisted by the comic contortionist in the interest of fun. And yet, when Dr. MERRY

Digitized by Google

gives one of his comparatively rare grammatical notes, the note is not always adequate. So on v. 10: *εἰ μή με βούλεσθ' ἀποπνιγέντα περιιδεῖν*, he is satisfied with a parallel from Eccl. 369: *μή με περίδῃς διαρραγέντα*. If there is to be a note at all, something might have been said about the aorist tense. By the way, my own explanation of the difference between *περιορᾶν* with present and *π.* with aor. part., first published in Morris's Thukydides, I 24 (A. J. P. X 124), has not met with much favor, I believe, and as *περιορᾶν* shares the peculiarities of its aorist construction with *ἐφορᾶν*, the tense is most easily explained by reference to the basic notion of the will in the one case and the wish in the other, as I pointed out in my review of Joost (A. J. P. XIV 103).—On v. 20 the neg. *μή* demands a note, but does not get it. It belongs to the *πῶς ἄν μή*+opt. category, about which the books are not always clear. In my L. and S. article I have been misrepresented, and not only there (A. J. P. XIX 233). Cf. Hdt. III 127: *τίς ἄν μοι τοῦτο ἐπιτελέσειε σοφίῃ καὶ μὴ βίῃ*; which Stein falsely calls an inexact usage. On v. 32: *τέως ἕως σαυτὸν λάθῃς διαρραγείς*, the editor cites the emendation of Dawes: *ἕως σεαυτὸν ἂν λάθῃς*, which does not deserve to be cited. In order to save what he considered the normal syntax, that respectable uniformity-monger tried to foist on the passage an abnormal position of *ἄν* which we find, to be sure, in Ran. 259, but which we have no right to emend into the texts. I am glad to see that in the new Oxford Aristophanes, HALL and GELDART have written *λάθοι*, with Reisig. See Sobolewski, Syntaxis Ar. capita selecta, p. 146.—There is no note on v. 85: *πρὶν ἰδίῃς καὶ διαλύσῃς*. To be sure, there is no real difficulty in the tense of *ἰδίῃς* (cf. Sobolewski, p. 144, and A. J. P. II 481), as the present overlaps, but the phenomenon is rare enough to deserve mention. —After *εἰ δὲ μή* (v. 262) there is no conscious ellipsis. He who supplies one, however, must supply not *σιωπᾶτε*, with Dr. MERRY, but *σιωπήσεσθε*.

By the time the beginner in Aristophanes has gone through half a dozen plays under Dr. MERRY'S guidance, he may be fully up to Aristophanes' parodic and paratragoedic tricks, and it may not be necessary to call attention to every playful mockery of language. So on v. 240: *ὁ δεινός, ὁ ταλαύρινος, ὁ κατὰ τοῖν σκελοῖν*, Dr. MERRY is satisfied with recalling Ach. 964: *ὁ δεινός, ὁ ταλαύρινος, ὃς τὴν Γοργόνα | πάλλει, κραδαίνων τρεῖς κατασκίους λόφους*, and that may, indeed, be sufficient; but the passage of the Acharnians is in King Cambyses' vein, while Pax 240 shows the cloven foot in the slang phrase *κατὰ τοῖν σκελοῖν*, on which I have a note in A. J. P. XI 372.

One more point. In a previous volume of the Journal I made my moan that Dr. MERRY did not condescend to furnish his

Digitized by Google

students with so much as a *conspectus metrorum* (XV 258), and the metres have been treated in the same stepmotherly fashion in this edition. That this can be done without loss I do not believe, and an illustration is at hand—one among many. No one who reads Aristophanes intelligently needs to be told that he must laugh when he comes to the passage in which the girls call after their ascending father (v. 114 foll.):

ὦ πάτερ, ὦ πάτερ, ἆρ' ἔτυμός γε
δώμασιν ἡμετέρους φάτις ἥκει κτέ.

The soaring dactylic rhythm would suffice to show that the stream of parody or paratragedy has been turned on; and when one consults the scholiast, one actually finds that Aristophanes is girding at a lyric passage of the Aiolos. But Dr. MERRY boggles at this because the combination ἔτυμος φάτις occurs in other passages of Euripides, and fails to notice that none of the passages cited is in the same metre as the Aiolos passage and the passage of the Peace. On the effect of the metre see Schmidt's Monodien, XL, where he analyzes the choral passage of Euripides, Andr. 1173–1196, in which occur the lines

ὦ γάμος, ὦ γάμος, ὃς τάδε δώματα
καὶ πόλιν ὤλεσας <ὤλεσας> ἀμάν.

The student who is not taught to see the fun of this has not been made to see all the fun.

The mention of *Euripides' Andromache* reminds me of Mr. HYSLOP'S recent edition of the Euripidean play (Macmillan). The book is intended for upper forms in schools, and being a school-book, falls outside of the direct range of this Journal. Still, school-books are not absolutely excluded from *Brief Mention*, and as the Andromache has not been edited to death and Mr. HYSLOP has not done his work badly, and has had, moreover, distinguished coadjutors, a remark or two may be pardoned even after my rambling comment on Dr. MERRY'S *Peace*. Like Dr. MERRY, Mr. HYSLOP eschews metres, though metres are of prime importance for Euripides, as he himself has intimated (Introduction, xvii); and the grammatical notes need to be supplemented. So, for instance, one misses a remark on πρὶν κλάειν (v. 577) instead of the normal πρὶν κλαῦσαι, the present being due to the *vapulare* meaning of κλάειν; and vv. 559, 571 ought to have suggested a remark on the indifference of the Euripidean σύν as to principal and subordinate persons. Nor is it without interest that, when Helen elopes, it is νεανίου μετ' ἀνδρός (v. 604), when the girls hie to the race course and palaestra, they have a swarm of young fellows about them, ξὺν νέοισιν (v. 597). There may be nothing in the distinction (A. J. P. VIII 218), but

Digitized by Google

Wilamowitz would not have failed to improve the opportunity. (See W. M. on Eur. H. F. 47.) In textual matters Mr. HYSLOP has been misled by the authority of Dr. RUTHERFORD to substitute for *ἐλπίς μ' ἀεὶ προσῆγε* the oxymoron *ἐλπίς μ' ἄελπτος ἦγε*. It is a clever conjecture and would be welcome in a corrupt passage, but the text as it stands is faultless, and *προσ-* is far from meaningless. It heightens the personification of *ἐλπίς*. For *ἐξικμάζω* (v. 405) RUTHERFORD suggests *ἐξιχμάζω*, which he supports by Hesychios, *ἴχματα* = *ἴχνια*. It would have been polite to quote Dindorf's *ἐξιχνεύω*, and, indeed, the progress of corruption may have been: *ἐξιχνεύω, ἐξιχνιάζω, ἐξικμάζω*. In v. 929 Mr. HYSLOP, who is justly shy of the potential optative, writes *πῶς οὖν, ἂν εἴποι τις, τάδ' ἐξήμαρτανες* for *πῶς οὖν τάδ' ὅποι τις*, on which see Starkie's Wasps, p. 410, and A. J. P. XII 387. The accents have not been watched so carefully as would have been desirable, and really *φκτειρ(α)* is intolerable in the year of grace 1900. See Cobet, cited A. J. P. VI 517, and K. B. I 2, 498, s. v.

In 1893 (A. J. P. XIV 111) some notice was taken of PALLIS'S *Version of the Iliad* into 'the living language of the Greek people.' After the lapse of seven years the second part has appeared, comprising the second hexad (H–M). Like the first part, it is calculated to dispel the illusions of those who fancy that Modern Greek is mainly like Loukes Laras or the flowing articles of the *Νέα Ἡμέρα* of Trieste; but, as in the former notice, only a short specimen can be given, the famous close of Θ:—

Ἔτσι ὅλη νύχτα κάθουνταν σ' τὶς στράτες τοῦ πολέμου
περήφανοι ὅλοι, κι' ἔκαιγαν πολλὲς φωτιὲς τριγύρω.
Πῶς τ' ἄστρα ἀπάνου ὁλόλαμπρα, μὲ τὸ λεφκὸ φεγγάρι
σ' τὴ μέση τους, φωτοβολοῦν σὰν τύχει καλωσύνη,
κι' ὅλες οἱ ράχες φαίνουνται, καὶ χαίρεται ὁ τσοπάνης,
τόσες τῶν πλοίων μεταξὺ καὶ τῶν νερῶν τοῦ Ξάνθου
φωτιὲς θαρροῦσες π' ἄναψαν μπροστὰ σ' τὸ κάστρο οἱ Τρῶες.
Χίλιες σ' τὸν κάμπο καίγανε φωτιὲς, κι' ἀπὸ πενῆντα
κοντὰ σὲ κάθε κάθουνταν νυχτοφωτίστρα φλόγα·
καὶ τ' ἄτια, βίκο τράγονταν κι' ἀσπρόγλυκο κριθάρι,
τὴν ὥρια πρόσμεναν Ἀβγὴ ὀρθὰ κοντὰ σ' τὰ πλοῖα.

By the way, the use of the famous *Δατισμός*, *χαίρεται*, common enough in Modern Greek, will please Dr. MERRY, who contends that the barbarism in Pax 291: *ὡς ἥδομαι καὶ χαίρομαι κεὐφραίνομαι*, is no barbarism and that the *Δατισμός* is a scholiast's figment.

Professor RICHARD ENGELMANN has on the stocks what he calls a *Tragischer Atlas*, which is to unite in one corpus all the vase-paintings that show the influence of tragedy. Of the

Digitized by Google

importance of the study of vases, which he thinks is losing ground by reason of the enormous accession of other archaeological material, he has given an interesting specimen in his *Archäologische Studien zu den Tragikern* (Weidmann). The first section is taken up with the evidence yielded by certain vases in favor of Dörpfeld's theory of the stage. The other two sections deal chiefly with questions concerning the plots of sundry lost plays of Sophokles and Euripides. This is a ticklish business, as every one knows, and it is sad to think that in a recent work on the subject, 'Greek Tragedy in the Light of Vase Painting,' the learned author, as ENGELMANN points out, has confounded 'Alcmeone' (Ital.) with 'Alcmene.' In his chapter on the Tyro of Sophokles (p. 51), ENGELMANN mentions a terracotta of Tanagra, which in his judgment represents the story of Tyro and her twins, and so disposes of the only shred of originality in Roman mythology. But the story of Romulus and Remus was exploded long ago; and it is going on twenty years since Mommsen volatilized the pyrrhic brother of the dactylic Romulus. See Hermes, XVI (1881), 1 foll.; A. J. P. III 107. The oblique cases of Remus formed a series of sadly desiderated iambi, and the preservation of the norm in Latin verse presents a curious parallel to the preservation of such words as 'pelf' and 'levin,' which have been saved alive by the necessities of rhyme.

Dr. OSGOOD'S study of the *Classical Mythology of Milton's English Poems* (Holt) has brought him face to face with the most difficult problems that the devotee of Milton has to encounter; and the Introduction, which deals with the genius of the poet as it modified and was modified by the forces of the world of culture in which he lived, not only shows an appreciation of the conditions of the research, but contributes to the better understanding of the art and thought of the most consciously artistic poet in the range of English literature. In the Second Part, which has to do with the sources, there seems to be a lack of lucid arrangement in the wealth of learning which Dr. OSGOOD has gathered, mainly from easily accessible repertories, and the classical scholar finds his nerves irritated by such admired disorder as he encounters, e. g., on p. 57: 'Vergil, Pindar, Nonius and Statius.' In fact it is very evident that to Dr. OSGOOD Classical Mythology is an adminicle to the study of Milton, and not a study in itself. So, for instance, he tells us: 'Ancient writers know little else to say about the gardens of Adonis.' In one sense that is true, but not in another, for the Ἀδώνιδος κῆποι of Plato's Phaidros, 276 B, are as famous in their way as Homer's garden of Alcinous. So, if Dr. OSGOOD had read the Θαλύσια for himself, *omnium eclogarum regina*, as Heinsius called it, he would not have sympathized with Jevons's timid note that 'perhaps the seventh idyll of Theocritus was in Milton's mind when he adopted the name Lycidas.' King is

Digitized by Google

Lycidas; Simichidas, Milton, and here and there one can hear verbal echoes. Lycidas and Simichidas, it is true, meet and part, and yet ξυνὰ γὰρ ὁδός, ξυνὰ δὲ καὶ ἀώς seems to be reflected in 'Together both ere the high lawns appeared | Under the opening eyelids of the Morn, | We drove afield.' On the other hand, it is not necessary to refer Milton's 'sage Hippotades' to Diodoros's sapient comment. The story of Aiolos in the Odyssey is sufficient warrant for the epithet.—'The dreaded name of Demogorgon' opens a chapter which Dr. OSGOOD closes too soon. In my judgment it would have been better to add that Demogorgon, the *Demorgorgonem* of Lactantius on Statius, Theb. IV 516, has for generations been suspected of being a popular corruption of the Gnostic Demiurgos. See Ersch u. Gruber. And *Demogorgone* or *Demogorgo* and *Demiurgo* seem to be hopelessly blended in Italian writers with which Milton must have been familiar. See the references in Tommaseo e Bellini, and especially the citation from Baldini's Mascherata (1565). Roscher mentions the possibility of a derivation from δημιοεργός, but does not notice the all-important Gnostic element. Italian, Latin, Greek is, I venture to say, the order of Milton's classicisms in more instances than the average reader suspects. Of course, Dr. OSGOOD is not unaware of this (see XLV, note), but he who would study Milton to the bottom must devote a lifetime to the work.—But criticism like this is of slight moment, in view of what Dr. OSGOOD has accomplished, and to have gained a permanent place in the student's Miltonic apparatus is a high honor in the outset of a scholar's career.

Under the title *Études sur l'antiquité grecque* (Hachette), the eminent Hellenist, M. HENRI WEIL, has made a collection of his recent papers, a present, as it were, from the venerable scholar to the parting century. These studies deal mainly with books that have come out in the last ten years, such as Rohde's Psyche, Gomperz's Griechische Denker, Girard's Education Athénienne, Arnim's Dion Chrysostomos; and with such important discoveries as the Odes of Bakchylides, the fragments of the Γεωργός and the Περικειρομένη of Menander, and the Oration of Hypereides against Athenogenes. While he stands up valiantly for the authenticity and the traditional date of the elegies of Tyrtaios against the assaults of the peace-breaker Verrall, M. WEIL is no stiff-necked conservative, and shows throughout the volume that the advance of years has not dulled his sympathy with the life and movement of the time that now is. One or two earlier papers have been taken up into the collection, a review of Blass's edition of Demosthenes (1885), and the interesting essay in which he attacked the prevalent poetical interpretation of ποιητής.

Digitized by Google

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 812 Broadway, New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Cicero (Marcus Tullius). Orations and Essays; tr. by C. D. Yonge, W. Melmoth, and G. E. Jeans; with a critical and biographical introd. by M. Smith. Aldine ed. (The World's Great Books.) New York, *Appleton*, 1900. c. 21 + 210 pp. Pl. por., 8vo, cl., $3. (Not sold separately.)

Demosthenes. Orations; tr. by C. R. Kennedy; with a critical and biographical introd. by R. B. Youngman. Aldine ed. (The World's Great Books.) New York, *Appleton*, 1900. c. 19 + 245 pp. Pl. por. facsim. 8vo, cl., $3. (Not sold separately.)

Fairbanks (Arthur). A Study of the Greek Paean. (Cornell Studies, No. 12.) New York, *Macmillan*, 1900. 8 + 166 pp. 8vo, bds., $1.

Frazer (Ja. G.) Pausanias and Other Greek Sketches. (Eversley Series.) New York, *Macmillan*, 1900. 10 + 419 pp. 8vo, cl., $1.50.

Homer. The Iliad done into English Prose, by Andrew Lang, Walter Leaf, and Ernest Myers. Cheaper ed. New York, *Macmillan*, 1900. 7 + 506 pp. 12mo, cl., 80 cts.

—— The Odyssey done into English Prose, by S. H. Butcher and Andrew Lang. Cheaper ed. New York, *Macmillan*, 1900. 24 + 409 pp. 12mo, cl., 80 cts.

Nepos (Cornelius). Twenty Lives; ed. by J. Edmund Barss. New York, *Macmillan*, 1900. 14 + 316 pp. Il. 12mo, hf. leath., 90 cts.

Sallust. The Bellum Catilinae, ed. on the basis of Schmalz's ed., with an introd. and vocabulary by C. G. Herbermann. Boston, *B. H. Sanborn & Co.*, 1900. c. '90, 1900. 14 + 192 pp. 16mo, cl., $1.

Sophocles, by R. C. Jebb. Pt. 2. Oedipus Coloneus. 3d ed. New York, *Macmillan*, 1900. 82 + 312 pp. 8vo, cl., $3.25.

ENGLISH.

Aristotle. The Ethics. Edited by J. Burnett. London, 1900. 8vo. 15s.

James (M. R.) Western MSS in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge: Descriptive Catalogue. Vol. I. Cambridge, 1900. 8vo. 15s.

Muirhead (J. H.) Chapters from Aristotle's Ethics. London, 1900. 8vo, 334 pp. 7s. 6d.

Murray (J. A. H.) New English Dictionary on Historical Principles. In–Infer. London, 1900. 4to. S. Nr. 690. 5s.

Nuttall Encyclopaedia, The. Ed. by J. Wood. London, 1900. 8vo, viii, 700 pp. 3s. 6d.

Digitized by Google

Skeat (W. W.) The Chaucer Canon. London, 1900. 8vo, 180 pp. 3s. 6d.

Tutin (J. R.) Concordance to Fitzgerald's Translation of Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám. London, 1900. 8vo, 178 pp. 8s. 6d.

Williams (M. M.) A Sanskrit-English Dictionary. New edition, enlarged with the collaboration of E. Leumann and C. Cappeller. London, 1900. 4to. £3 13s. 6d.

FRENCH.

Cartault (A.) Études sur les satires d'Horace. Paris, *Alcan*. In-8. 11 fr.

Lefèvre (A.) La grèce antique. Paris, 1900. 12mo. 6 fr.

Michel (C.) Recueil d'inscriptions grecques. Bruxelles, 1900. 8vo, xxvi, 1000 pp. 20 fr.

Ouvré (H.) Les formes littéraires de la pensée grecque. Paris, *Alcan*. In-8. 10 fr.

GERMAN.

Andresen (Georg). In Taciti historias studia critica et palaeographica. II. Progr. 4. 30 S. Berlin, *R. Gaertner*. m. 1.

Apulei (Lucii) Madaurensis, apologia sive de magia liber et florida. Recensuit J. van der Vliet. 8. ix, 202 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 4.

Brugmann (Karl) u. Delbrück (Berthold). Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen. 5. Bd.: Vergleichende Syntax v. B. Delbrück. 3. Thl. (Nebst Indices zu den 3 Thln. der Syntax v. C. Cappeller.) 8. xx, 608 S. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner*. m. 15.

Capellanus (Geo.) Sprechen Sie lateinisch? 3. Aufl. 8. 118 S. Dresden, *C. A. Koch*. m. 1.80.

Christ (W.) Philologische Studien zu Clemens Alexandrinus. [Aus 'Abhandlgn. d. k. bayer. Akad. d. Wiss.'] 4. 74 S. München, *G. Franz' Verl.* m. 3.

Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca. Edita consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae. Vol. V, pars 2. Lex. 8. Berlin, *G. Reimer*. —V 2. Themistii in Aristotelis physica paraphrasis. Ed. Henr. Schenkl. xli, 272 S. m. 12.

Corpus inscriptionum semiticarum ab academia inscriptionum et litterarum humaniorum conditum atque digestum. Pars IV. Inscriptiones himyariticas et sabaeas continens. Tom. I. Fasc. 3. Fol. S. 175–322. With Atlas. Fol. 9 Taf. Paris, *C. Klincksieck*. m. 50.

Dissertationes philologicae Halenses. Vol. XIV, pars 3. 8. Halle, *M. Niemeyer*.—III. Körtge (Gust.) In Suetonii de viris illustribus libros inquisitionum capita tria. 98 S. m. 2.40.

Dziatzko (Karl). Untersuchungen üb. ausgewählte Kapitel des antiken Buchwesens. Mit Text, Uebersetzg. u. Erklärg. v. Plinius, Nat. hist. XIII, §§68–89. 8. v, 206 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 6.

Engelmann (Rich.) Archäologische Studien zu den Tragikern. Lex. 8. vii, 90 S. m. 28 Abbildgn. Berlin, *Weidmann*. m. 6.

Euripidis fabulae, edd. R. Prinz et N. Wecklein. Vol. III, pars 2. gr. 8. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*.—II. Hippolytus, ed. N. Wecklein. vi, 84 S. m. 2.80.

Lidzbarski (Mark). Ephemeris f. semitische Epigraphik. 1. Bd. 1. Hft. 8. 108 S. m. 18 Abbildgn. Giessen, *J. Ricker*. m. 5.

Digitized by Google

Lysiae orationes, scholarum in usum ed. Henr. van Herwerden. 8. xvi, 262 S. Groningen, *J. B. Wolters*. m. 2.50.

Pfuhl (Ernest). De Atheniensium pompis sacris. 8. vi, 111 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. m. 4.

Poetae lyrici graeci collegit Theod. Bergk. Ed. V, pars 1. Vol. I. 8. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 14.—I. Pindari carmina recensuit Otto Schroeder. vi, 514 S. m. 1 Taf.

Raeder (Joannes). De Theodoreti graecarum affectionum curatione quaestiones criticae. 8. v, 190 S. Kopenhagen, *G. E. C. Gad*. m. 4.50.

Saga-Bibliothek, altnordische. Hrsg. v. Gust. Cederschiöld, Hugo Gering u. Eug. Mogk. 8. Hft. 8. Halle, *M. Niemeyer*.—8. Grettis saga Ásmundarsonar. Hrsg. v. B. C. Boer. lii, 348 S. m. 10.

Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften. Hrsg. v. H. Collitz u. W. F. Bechtel. 3. Bd. 2. Hälfte. 2. Hft. 8. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht*. —2. Blass (Frdr.) Die Inschriften v. Thera u. Melos. S. 147–226. m. 2.80.

Sanskrit-Drucke. Eine Sammlg. ind. Texte begründet v. Karl F. Geldner. 1. 8. Greifswald, *J. Abel*. m. 5.—1. Halâyudha's Kavirahasya in beiden Recensionen hrsg. v. Ludw. Heller. viii, 101 S.

Stati (P. Papini) Silvae. Ed. Alfr. Klotz. 8. xcii, 204 S. m. 1 Taf. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 2.

Winckler (Hugo). Altorientalische Forschungen. 2. Reihe. III. Bd. 1. Hft. (XIV. der ganzen Folge.) 8. Leipzig, *E. Pfeiffer*.—1. Die zeitangaben Mesas. Die golah in Daphne. Obadja. S. 401–432. m. 1.80.

Zimmermann (Alb.) Kritische Nachlese zu den Posthomerica des Quintus Smyrnaeus. Progr. 8. 47 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 4.

ITALIAN.

Consoli (S.) Il neologismo negli scritti di Plinio il giovane. Palermo. 16mo, p. 133. L. 3.

Platone. Della Repubblica, libri dieci tradotti da Ruggero Bonghi. Torino. 16mo, p. 692.—Dialoghi di Platone. Vol. VII. L. 8.

Studi italiani di filologia classica. Volume VII. Firenze. 8vo, p. 506. L. 20.

Digitized by Google

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Arabo parlato in Egitto (L'). Grammatica, dialoghi e raccolta di circa 6000 vocaboli per cura di C. A. Nallino. (Manuali Hoepli.) Milano, *Ulrico Hoepli*, 1900.

Aristophanes. Peace; with introduction and notes by W. W. Merry. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1900.

'Αθηνᾶ. Σύγγραμμα περιοδικὸν τῆς ἐν 'Αθήναις ἐπιστημονικῆς ἑταιρείας. Τ. ιβ'. Τεῦχος ά καὶ β'. 'Αθήνησιν, 1900.

Baldwin (Edwin George). The Laws of the XII Tables. Text and translation. Bloomington, Ind., *The Author*.

Bevier (Louis). Acoustic Analysis of the Vowel *A*. (Separatabdruck aus 'Die neueren Sprachen,' May, 1900.)

—— The Acoustic Analysis of the Vowels from the Phonographic Record. (Reprinted from the 'Physical Review,' vol. X, No. 4, April, 1900.)

Bréal (Michel). Sur la critique des textes en ses rapports avec la linguistique. (Bulletin des humanistes français, N. S., no. 1.) Paris, *La Société* (Sorbonne).

Ciceros Ausgewählte Reden. Herausg. v. K. Halm. II. Band. 10. Auflage. Bes. v. G. Laubmann. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1900. 2 m. 40 pf.

Comparetti (Domenico). Iscrizione arcaica del foro romano, edita ed illustrata da D. C. Firenze-Roma, *Fratelli Bencini*, 1900.

Cornelius Nepos. Twenty Lives. Ed. by J. E. Barss. (Macmillan's Latin Series.) New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1900.

Deubner (Ludovicus). De incubatione. Capita quattuor. Lipsiae, *B. G. Teubner*, MCM.

Elementi di grammatica turca osmanli, per il Dr. Luigi Bonelli. (Manuali Hoepli.) Milano, *Ulrico Hoepli*, 1900.

Encyclopédiste (L'). No. 3. Paris, 6, Rue Madame. @ 50 centimes.

Engelmann (Richard). Archäologische Studien zu den Tragikern. Mit 28 Abbildungen. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1900.

ΕΠΙΤΟΜΗ ΤΗΣ ΚΑΙΝΗΣ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗΣ. By Nicholas J. Scoffel. Notre Dame, Ind., *The University Press*, 1900.

Fairbanks (Arthur). A Study of the Greek Paean. (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology. Ed. by C. E. Bennett and G. P. Bristol. No. XII.) New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1900. $1.

France (W. C.) The Emperor Julian's Relation to the New Sophistic. (Chicago Diss.)

Gray (Louis H.) Contributions to Avestan Syntax: the Conditional Sentence. (Annals N. Y. Ac. Sci., vol. XII, no. 13.)

—— Zur indogermanischen Syntax von **nāman*.

Hanssen (Friedrich). Zur spanischen u. portugiesischen Metrik. (Separatabzug aus den 'Verhandlungen des Deutschen wissenschaftlichen Vereins in Santiago,' B. IV.) Valparaiso, *G. Helfmann*, 1900.

Digitized by Google

Henry (Victor). Lexique étymologique des termes les plus usuels du Breton moderne. (Bibliothèque Bretonne Armoricaine, fascicule III.) Rennes, *Plihon et Hervé*, 1900.

Hübner (Émile). Nouvelles inscriptions latines d'Emerita Augusta en Espagne. (Tirage à part de la 'Revue des études anciennes,' tome II, no. 2, Avril–Juin, 1900.)

Ἰλιάδα (Ἡ) *μεταφρασμένη ἀπ' τὸν* Ἀλεξ. Παλλῆ. *Μέρος δέφτερο* Η–Μ. Ἀθῆνα, 1900.

Muret-Sanders. Encyklopädisches Wörterbuch der englischen u. deutschen Sprache. Lfg. 16: mörderisch–Pacht. Vollständig in 24 Lfgn. New York, *The International News Co.*, 1900. @ 1 m. 50 pf.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte u. deutsche Litteratur u. für Pädagogik. Herausg. v. Johannes Ilberg u. Richard Richter. III. Jahrg. V. u. VI. Bandes. 4. Heft. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1900.

Nohl (H.) Schülerkommentar zu Ciceros Rede für L. Murena. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1900. 30 pf.

Pfuhl (Ernestus). De Atheniensibus pompis sacris. Berolini, *Apud Weidmannos*, MCM.

Plutarque. De la musique (ΠΕΡΙ ΜΟΥΣΙΚΗΣ). Édition critique et explicative. Par Henri Weil et Th. Reinach. Paris, *Ernest Leroux*, 1900.

Potter (H. A.) Dix contes modernes edited by. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1900.

Publications of the Modern Language Association of America. Edited by James W. Bright. Vol. XV, No. 2. N. S., Vol. VIII, No. 2.—VI. Schofield (W. H.) The Lays of Graelant and Lanval and the Story of Wayland.—VII. Tupper (J. W.) A Study of Pope's Imitation of Horace.—VIII. Hempl (George). The Mφjebro Stone and the Runic Ligature for *ng*.—IX. McKnight (G. H.) Germanic Elements in the Story of King Horn.—X. Merrill (Katharine). Characterization in the Beginning of Thackeray's Pendennis. Baltimore, *The Association*, 1900.

Revue des humanités en Belgique. III 4. Avril, 1900. *Hasselt*. @ 2 fr.

Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis.

Aeschyli Tragoediae c. Fragmentis. Recogn. A. Sidgwick. 3s. 6d.

Apollonii Rhodii Argonautica. Recogn. R. C. Seaton. 3s.

Aristophanis Comoediae. Tom. I. Recogn. I. W. Hall et W. M. Geldart. 3s. 6d.

Xenophontis Opera. Tom. I (Historia Graeca). Recogn. E. C. Marchant. 3s.

Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*, 1900.

Skeat (Walter W.) The Chaucer Canon. With a discussion of the works associated with the name of Geoffrey Chaucer. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*, 1900. 3s. 6d.

Tropea (G.) Studi sugli scriptores Historiae Augustae. IV. Elio Cordo. Vita e frommenti. Messina, *Rivista di Storia antica*, 1900.

Weil (Henri). Études sur l'antiquité grecque. Paris, *Hachette et Cie.*, 1900. 3 fr. 50.

Whitman (C. H.) The Christ of Cynewulf. Translated into English prose. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1900.

Xenophon. A Commentary on the Hellenica of. By G. C. Underhill. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde & Co.*, 1900.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

VOL. XXI, 3 WHOLE NO. 83

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
DEC 4 1900
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

THE

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY

BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE

PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

BALTIMORE: THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
LONDON: KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & CO.
LEIPSIC: F. A. BROCKHAUS

JULY, AUGUST, SEPTEMBER
1900

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS.

I.—The Chthonic Gods of Greek Religion. By ARTHUR FAIRBANKS, 241

II.—Notes on Cicero's Use of the Imperfect and Pluperfect Subjunctive in *si*-Clauses. By H. C. NUTTING, ... 260

III.—*Apąm Napāt* Again. By H. W. MAGOUN, ... 274

IV.—Items from the Gāthic Pahlavi. By L. H. MILLS, ... 287

V.—Notes on the Modern Minsi-Delaware Dialect. By J. DYNELEY PRINCE, ... 295

VI.—De *Quoque* Adverbio. Scripsit GUILELMUS HAMILTON KIRK, . 303

VII.—A Papyrus Fragment of Iliad E. By EDGAR J. GOODSPEED, . . 310

NOTE: 315

The Etymology of ΣΘΕΝΟΣ. By GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES: 317

Brugmann's Griechische Grammatik.—Monier-Williams' A Sanskrit-English Dictionary.—Smyth's Greek Melic Poets.—Weil and Reinach's Plutarque, De la musique (Περὶ Μουσικῆς).

REPORTS: 334

The Journal of Germanic Philology.—Philologus.

BRIEF MENTION, ... 350

RECENT PUBLICATIONS, ... 355

BOOKS RECEIVED, ... 358

Open to original communications in all departments of philology, classical, comparative, oriental, modern; condensed reports of current philological work; summaries of chief articles in the leading philological journals of Europe; reviews by specialists; bibliographical lists. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price $3.00 a year, payable to the publisher in advance; single numbers, $1.00 each. Suitable advertisements will be inserted at the following rates:

	1 TIME.	2 T.	3 T.	4 T.
One page	$16 00	$30 00	$40 00	$50 00
Half page	8 00	15 00	20 00	25 00
Quarter page	4 00	8 00	12 00	15 00
Eighth page	2 00	4 00	6 00	8 00

The English Agents of the American Journal of Philology are Messrs. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Paternoster House, Charing Cross Road, London, W. C.

SPECIAL NOTICE.—The stock of complete sets of THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY has passed over into the hands of the undersigned. These sets will be sold for the present at the regular price, $60 for the twenty volumes, cash to accompany the order. Single volumes, $3; single numbers, $1 each, so far as they can be supplied. Address

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore, Md.

Published quarterly. Three dollars a year (postage paid). Entered at the Postoffice of Baltimore, Md., as second-class matter.

Press of The Friedenwald Co.
Baltimore, Md.

Digitized by Google

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
DEC 4 1900
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXI, 3. WHOLE NO. 83.

I.—THE CHTHONIC GODS OF GREEK RELIGION.

Some of the most distinctive and interesting developments of Greek religion are connected with the so-called chthonic gods. If, however, the student turn to the handbooks on Greek mythology and Greek worship, he finds many conflicting statements about these deities. For example, Preller[1] holds that the chthonic gods of Homer are the rulers of the underworld—dread rulers, for man naturally expects blessings from above and evils from beneath; while in later time, he seeks to prove, their nature became milder because of their increasing connection with agriculture. H. D. Müller[2] adopted the first part of Preller's thesis and denied the latter. His view was that chthonic gods were always regarded as the source of evils that men seek to avert, never the source of blessing. Starting with the fact that chthonic gods were specially feared, K. O. Müller[3] made the striking suggestion that in Greece propitiatory sacrifices were offered only to the chthonic gods. Very much the same idea is adopted by Stengel,[4] with the result that Apollo, Artemis, and indeed most of the Olympic divinities, come to be classed as at times chthonic gods. Finally, Diels[5] seems to include the worship of the dead, of chthonic gods proper, and of heroes, together with all propitiatory and purificatory rites, under one heading, and to

[1] L. Preller, Demeter und Persephone, S. 183 f.
[2] H. D. Müller, Mythologie der griech. Stämme, II 39 f.
[3] K. O. Müller, Aeschylos, Eumeniden, p. 146 f.
[4] P. Stengel, Die griech. Sakralalterthümer, S. 87.
[5] H. Diels, Sibyllinische Blätter, passim, e. g. S. 71.

Digitized by Google

apply the term 'chthonic' to this whole group of divinities and to this entire type of worship.

The reason for this confusion is not difficult to ascertain, but a clear statement of the truth is none the less to be desired. With this end in view, I propose first to ask just how the term 'chthonic' is used in literature and in cultus, secondly to examine the character of the chthonic deities as compared with that of other deities, and thirdly to study the data that remain as to their worship, in order to ascertain how far it is true that their worship differs from that of other gods.

I.

Both the noun *χθών* and the adjective formed from it are, strictly speaking, poetic words, although the influence of the poetic conception was so great that they came to be used in prose and in later accounts of cultus. The idea of chthonic gods starts with the epic division of the universe into what is above the earth and what is below the earth. The higher gods, the gods in whose realm is included man's daily life on the earth, are called *Ὀλύμπιοι, Οὐρανίωνες*; and are ranged, now in a family, now in a *βουλή*, on Olympos. Below the earth—or in the dim West—is another realm, the dark counterpart of the brightness of Olympos. Here mighty Hades[1] (called also Zeus *καταχθόνιος*) and dread Persephone rule over the shades of the dead; from the deep, from Erebos, the Erinyes guard the rights of the first-born, protect the stranger, pursue the oathbreaker.[2] The realm beneath the earth becomes in the epic a kingdom of the dead corresponding to the rule of the heavenly gods over living men.

In later poetry—for example, in Aischylos[3]—the *ὕπατοι θεοί* are set over against the *χθόνιοι θεοί*; the gods above,[4] *οἱ ἄνω θεοί*, over against those below, *οἱ κάτω θεοί, οἱ κατὰ χθονὸς θεοί*. This division is simply the continuation of the epic belief. The gods above are the Olympian gods of the epic, the universal gods of Greece, the gods worshipped in the normal cultus of the state; the gods below are the gods that have to do with the dead—Hades, to whose realm men go at death; Hermes, who conducts them thither;

[1] Iliad, O 187 f.; Υ 57 f.; I 457; Hesiod, Theog. 767.

[2] Iliad, Γ 278 f.; I 457; Ξ 274.

[3] Agam. 89; Suppl. 25; Pindar, Ol. I 43, XIII 24; Lyr. frag. adesp. 140.

[4] Soph. Ai. 865; Ant. 451, cf. 749; El. 291; Aisch. Pers. 689, cf. 619; Eur. Alc. 75; cf. Plato, Leg. 828 C.

Digitized by Google

the Erinyes, whose home, according to the epic, is with the gods of souls, etc. The phrase *οἱ χθόνιοι* is often used as equivalent to *οἱ ἔνεροι*, to designate the spirits of the dead.[1] Or, again, the adjective *χθόνιος* is used with other words, e. g. with *ἑστία* ('home, or resting-place of the soul,' Soph. O. C. 1727), with *φάμα* ('rumor that reaches souls,' Soph. El. 1066), to designate that which has to do with souls or with the abode of souls.[2] It is consistent with this general use of the word that the *χθόνιοι θεοί* are the gods connected with souls.[3] Only rarely is the adjective used in a more general sense to designate that which has to do with the earth.[4] E. g. in Hesiod[5] the Titans are *χθόνιοι*, perhaps because their place is in Tartaros, probably because they are children of earth (*χθών* = *γῆ*), i. e. *γηγενεῖς*.

The number of gods who are thus connected with souls and with the abode of the dead is quite limited. They may be divided into two classes: gods who have no other function, and gods who are connected with the Olympic group, but who also have something to do with souls. Of the former class are the 'rulers of the dead,' Hades and Persephone his bride. Hades is called now *χθόνιος*, now *κατὰ χθονός*[6]; to him and to Persephone[7] Electra prays for aid in avenging her father's death; the king of the dead, *βασιλεὺς τῶν ἐνέρων*, as well as Ge and Hermes, is invoked to send back the soul of Darius.[8] In the Choephoroi of Aischylos Orestes[9] prays to Gaia to let his murdered father view the contest (in which he is to be avenged), and Electra prays to Persephone to grant also goodly power (to the soul), and then the father himself is invoked. Probably we are to understand the *ἡ νερτέρα θεός*, who conducts Oidipous below,[10] as referring to Persephone, and no doubt she is to be included under the phrase

[1] Aisch. Pers. 640; Choeph. 356, [399,] 476 f.; Pind. P. IV 159.

[2] Cf. also Soph. O. C. 1752; Eur. Alc. 902; Hel. 344, 1346; Pind. P. IV 43; Alkm. Frag. 151; Plato, Pol. 619 E.

[3] Soph. O. C. 1568; Eur. Hec. 79.

[4] The word is used in this general sense Pind. Frag. 88; [Aisch. Sept. 736;] Eur. Frag. 27.

[5] Theog. 697, cf. also Aisch. Sept. 521 f.; Eur. Bacch. 540.

[6] Eur. Alc. 237; Andr. 544; Phoen. 810.

[7] Soph. El. 110 f.

[8] Aisch. Pers. 628.

[9] Aisch. Choeph. 479 f.

[10] Soph. O. C. 1548.

Digitized by Google

θεαὶ χθόνιαι as it is used by Sophokles[1] and Herodotos.[2] Ge is invoked as the ruler of the χθόνιοι, i. e. the ruler of the souls of the dead[3]; and as a χθόνιος δαίμων, the Persian elders pray to her to let the soul of Darius appear.[4] The essentially poetic character of this whole line of thought is evident from the position assigned to Γῆ as the divinity who controls the fate of souls[5] (for their bodies were buried in γῆ, the earth), as well as from such a passage as Aisch. Suppl. 24, where χθόνιοι [θεοί] receives the defining phrase θῆκας κατέχοντες 'gods that possess the tombs of the dead.'[6]

Finally, the Erinyes are distinctly gods associated with souls of the dead. This was the Homeric conception[7]; it continues in Aischylos[8] and probably in Sophokles.[9] The Erinyes were all but identified with the dead man's curse which finally brought his injurer to punishment, and so wrought out the justice of Zeus[10]; from this standpoint Δίκη is "coassessor of the gods below."[11] In cult, as we shall see, the Erinyes retained the epithet σεμναί, which was especially appropriate to gods connected with souls. Probably Hekate "shaking coils of serpents"[12] should also be reckoned in this class as distinctly a god of souls, although Hekate comes to represent one side of the being of Artemis.[13]

Of the deities associated with Olympos, Hermes, Demeter, and Zeus receive the epithet χθόνιος. Hermes is the herald, whose office takes him to gods below the earth as well as to the gods of

[1] O. C. 1568.
[2] VI 134, VII 153.
[3] Aisch. Pers. 640.
[4] Aisch. Pers. 629; cf. Paus. I 28, 6.
[5] Aisch. Choeph. 722 f., where χθών and the tomb are invoked.
[6] Cf. also Aisch. Pers. 689.
[7] Iliad, Γ 278 f.; T 259 f.; I 571 f.
[8] Choeph. 398 f. and probably 405.
[9] El. 112 f. and possibly O. C. 1568.
[10] Aisch. Choeph. 381 f.
[11] Soph. Ant. 451, cf. 749; El. 291 f.; cf. also Bergk, P. L. G. III⁴, p. 733.
[12] Aristoph. Frag. 426.
[13] It seems to me possible that the reference to Hekate in Sophokles, Ant. 1199, might suggest that she performed a function like that of Hermes in conducting the soul to its proper home beneath the earth. If so, the phrase ἡ νερτέρα θεά, in O. C. 1548, would also be taken as a reference to Hekate, and not to Persephone.

Digitized by Google

Olympos and to men on the earth.[1] The dead are under his care, πατρῷ' ἐποπτεύων κράτη,[2] and in this capacity he is invoked to be the ally of Orestes,[3] and to allow the soul of Darius to return to this earth.[4] He is mentioned by Sophokles as the god who conducts souls to Hades,[5] and as such Aias asks his aid.[6] Demeter, so far as I am aware, does not receive the epithet in poetry. In Herodotos,[7] however, the phrase χθόνιαι θεαί clearly means the goddesses of the Mysteries, and it is quite probable that the phrase is used in the same way by Sophokles.[8] The Eleusinian goddess granted special blessings after death, so that she might well be classed as a deity who had to do with souls. The case of Zeus is somewhat peculiar.[9] In Homer[10] Zeus κατα-χθόνιος is unquestionably another name for Hades. On the other hand, the Zeus χθόνιος of Attic tragedy thunders, i. e. he exercises the function of Olympian Zeus[11]; moreover, we have mention of a Zeus ἐνάλιος.[12] 'Zeus of the sea' is to be understood as indicating one of the phases of the Olympian Zeus, and the same is probably true of the Zeus χθόνιος of Sophokles and the later drama. These passages, which refer to Zeus as the god of thunder, continue the thought of Homer and Aischylos. In Homer the thunders of Zeus reach down to the realm of Aidoneus and disturb him,[13] and in Aischylos the thunders of Zeus are called chthonic because they reverberate from the earth.[14] Aischylos in the Agamemnon[15] speaks of Zeus as a god of souls: τοῦ κατὰ χθονὸς Διὸς νεκρῶν σωτῆρος, but an examination of a passage in the Suppliants makes it plain that this is only another side of the Olympian Zeus.[16] In this passage Aischylos also speaks of a Ἑρμῆς ἄλλος and an Apollo

[1] Odyssey, ω 1 f.; Aisch. Choeph. 124.
[2] Choeph. 1, cf. 727; Schol. Aristoph. Ach. 1076, and on Ran. 218.
[3] Cf. also Soph. El. 110 f.
[4] Aisch. Pers. 629.
[5] Ψυχοπομπός, Soph. O. C. 1548.
[6] Soph. Ai. 832; Aristoph. Ran. 1145.
[7] VI 134, VII 153.
[8] O. C. 1568.
[9] K. Lehrs, Populäre Aufsätze², S. 298 f.; E. Rohde, Psyche, S. 191.
[10] Iliad, I 457.
[11] Soph. O. C. 1606; Eur. Hipp. 1201; Aristoph. Aves 1747 f.
[12] Prokl. on Plato, Crat. 88; Paus. II 24, 4.
[13] Iliad, Υ 56 f.
[14] Prom. 994.
[15] Agam. 1386.
[16] Suppl. 156 f., 231, etc.

Digitized by Google

φυγάδ' ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ θεόν, i. e. each of these gods has another phase to his being besides that ordinarily recognized. So Zeus, the god of souls, is essentially the same as the god who pursued Io,[1] i. e. Zeus χθόνιος is another side of the being of Zeus Ὀλύμπιος, a side which seems quite different from the one commonly recognized: it is only Homer who uses Zeus καταχθόνιος as another name for Hades. The reverberation of thunder, apparently from the earth, Zeus's care for justice through the curses of the dead, and the universalizing tendency which affected Zeus particularly, are three factors in making this extension in the sway of Zeus. In a fragment of the Cretans of Euripides (Frag. 904) the poet goes even farther, and identifies Hades himself[2] with Zeus the 'heavenly King.'[3]

Enough has been said to show that lyric and dramatic poetry continue the conception of the epic. Chthonic gods are gods of the realm beneath the earth, which is the realm of souls. They are not *gods* of the souls, for, strictly speaking, only living men worship the gods. They are *rulers* of souls[4]; while from the standpoint of men who offer them worship, they are gods whose home is below the earth, gods who are associated with souls. As gods, men invoke them when the souls of the dead are worshipped, when a man seeks help to avenge wrongs against the dead, or when souls of the dead are to be evoked by magic rites.[5]

But one other passage in earlier poetry remains to be considered. Hesiod (Erg. et Di. 465) directs the farmer to pray to Zeus χθόνιος and Demeter ἀγνή when he begins ploughing. This use of the word to denote a god of agriculture appears occasionally in the accounts of Greek cultus. In the well-known Mykonos inscription[6] there is a direction to sacrifice yearly black offerings to Zeus chthonios and Ge chthonia ὑπὲρ καρπῶν. Clearly, this Zeus is a god of agriculture, the giver of fruits. This function of Zeus, at Athens as well as elsewhere, is too familiar to need

[1] Aisch. Suppl. 162.

[2] So Latin poets identified the bride of Hades with Juno, Verg. Aen. VI 138; Ovid, Met. XIV 114.

[3] Dionysos, so far as I am aware, receives the epithet χθόνιος only in late hymns, e. g. Hym. Orph. LIII 1; the epithet, however, is justified by his connection with spirits of the dead; cf. Roscher, Lexikon, I 1033, 50 f. and 1069, 33.

[4] Aisch. Pers. 629, 640; Choeph. [399]; Paus. II 31, 2.

[5] Odyss. κ, λ; Pind. P. IV 43.

[6] Dittenberger, S. I. G. 373; Bull. Corr. Hell. XII 459 f.

Digitized by Google

illustration. In Hesiod and in the Mykonos inscription, then, the epithet χθόνιος denotes Zeus the giver of the fruits of the earth. It is in connection with a harvest feast at Hermione that Demeter also receives the epithet χθονία.

Given these two meanings of the term 'chthonic' as applied to the gods—(*a*) a poetic term to denote a god associated with souls, and (*b*) a cultus term to denote a god of agriculture—it remains to consider whether they are so closely associated that they can safely be merged into one, as is done by some recent writers,[1] or whether they are not necessarily connected. This is simply the question whether the rulers of the dead and the gods of agriculture are necessarily identical, or whether the two functions are only occasionally connected. An examination of this group of divinities shows that the connection is not so close as is ordinarily supposed. To say with Preller[2] that the gods of the underworld were at first dread gods of souls, but that later they were made milder by their association with agriculture, does not seem to me to cover the facts. Hades remains dark and terrible to the end, and when Plouton is used as a name for Hades, he shares the same characteristics. Wealth, child of Demeter, in Eleusinian legend is not ὁ θεός, the husband of Persephone; in fact, the two sets of ideas are so separate that the bride of Hades and the daughter of Demeter appear in cult monuments[3] as two distinct beings. And when the later Attic drama applied the name Plouton to Hades, the original traits of the king of the shades remained unchanged; the only change was that the name Plouton might now mean either Hades or Ploutos. When a god rather than a goddess is worshipped for good crops, it is commonly Zeus. On the other hand, πλουτώνια are places of access to the lower world, where souls of the dead are evoked. The Zeus chthonios of Mykonos, the agricultural Zeus of Athens or of Magnesia, are not, so far as we know, kings of the lower world; while neither Hermes nor Hekate has any special connection with agriculture.

The truth seems to be that this connection between gods of the earth as receiving the dead (a poetic use) and gods of the earth as producing the grain (a cultus use) is purely local. In Athens the Erinyes were worshipped as Eumenides,[4] who favored men

[1] E. g. Rohde, Psyche, S. 190 f.

[2] Demeter und Persephone, S. 188 f.; cf. Artemid. Oneir. II 34, 2.

[3] The reliefs of Lysimachides and Lakrateides, Ἐφ. Ἀρχ. 1886, πίν. 3.

[4] Aisch. Eum. 904 f., 938 f.

Digitized by Google

with good crops; at Eleusis, Demeter, goddess of the grain, is also a goddess associated with souls. It is only in the Peloponnese, however, that any close connection between agricultural deities and chthonic deities proper can be proved. At Hermione the harvest goddess is Demeter chthonia, and the harvest feast is connected with a Πλουτώνιον. At Sparta this same Demeter chthonia seems to be queen of the underworld, and in several cities it is Demeter rather than Persephone, i. e. it is the goddess of the grain, who is identified with the local 'Despoina' in the worship of the pair who rule the underworld. Demeter Erinys of Thelpousa, Demeter Melaina of Phigaleia, are instances of the grain goddess as a goddess who rules the souls; and when Herkyna of Lebadeia becomes Demeter Herkyna, it is the union of a grain goddess and a soul goddess.

My conclusion is that, in spite of the fact that agricultural functions are frequently attributed to gods of the underworld, gods who rule over souls, it is impossible to identify the two classes of gods. In that case there can be no question that it is wiser for us to use the name 'chthonic,' as it is almost universally used in Greek poetry and in Greek worship, to mean only gods who are associated with souls. The term will not, then, include Apollo, Artemis, Poseidon, or the Winds, as at times chthonic gods.[1] It will not include the heroes, for, in general, Greek cultus draws a sharp line between souls of the dead and heroes who did not die, but were translated into a higher sphere of existence. And while the term can not always be denied to Zeus, the god of agriculture, the presumption is that when it is applied to him, he is also a god connected with souls.[2]

There are, as a matter of fact, four classes of divine beings that are connected with the earth: *a*) souls of the dead, *b*) rulers of souls, *c*) agricultural gods, and *d*) heroes. Particularly in the works of Aischylos the first two classes are treated as essentially alike: prayers are offered, now to the dead, now to the gods with the dead, and the dead are regarded as powerful to work good or evil to surviving men.[3] We have seen that in certain localities the second and third classes are also merged into one. Local

[1] Stengel, Griech. Kultusaltertümer, S. 87.

[2] Certainly there is no justification in Greek usage for the indiscriminate application of this term to all divinities connected with darkness, as in the discussion by O. Gilbert, Griech. Götterlehre, S. 39 f.

[3] Aisch. Choeph. 476 f.; Pers. 219, 523 f., 609, 620, 641; Choeph. 355, 479.

Digitized by Google

heroes, however, in spite of their connection with caves or with some spot in the earth, are sharply separated from the rulers of the dead and from souls generally. In fact they are often connected with Olympos, in that they are regarded as phases of some Olympian divinity (e. g. Zeus Trophonios, Artemis Iphigeneia). This might perhaps be explained by the fact that many of these heroes were closely associated with Olympian gods in the epic, whereas the realm of Hades was in the epic the direct counterpart of Olympos. Or again, the very movement by which so many local gods were merged in these great gods of Greece may be said to presuppose a likeness of nature between local gods who came to be regarded as mere heroes and the Olympian divinities in whom other local gods were merged. The local heroes are very often conceived as presiding over agriculture in the section where they are worshipped, from the very fact that they are local, and so concerned with the local interests of their worshippers. Moreover, they are commonly connected with some spot in the earth, for this is all that gives them individuality in worship.

II.

After defining, as I have attempted to do, the use of the term 'chthonic' as applied to the gods, I should like (1) to raise the question whether as a class their character differs from that of the Olympic divinities, and (2) to examine the assertion frequently made, that there is something distinctive and peculiar about their worship.

We have seen already that the conception of the chthonic gods was in large measure formed by the epic. The gods below correspond in a way to the council of the gods on Olympos, though the lesser spirits of the deep are not brought into any such close relation with one another as are the Olympic divinities. In spite of the epic influence, the *local* nature of the chthonic gods is very pronounced. The worship of Hades-Plouton is carried on almost entirely in connection with Ploutonia, wild chasms where men felt that an open way led down from this world to the house of Hades. Of the queen of the lower world I need only say that the conception of her character, her name, and her relation with Demeter or Persephone, differ exceedingly in different localities, and that the conception is in each instance

Digitized by Google

linked with the ritual of a particular shrine. So the Erinyes were not worshipped except in some local shrines like that described by Sophokles, and in such cases their intimate connection with the spot of earth devoted to them is very marked.

Again, the *office* of these divinities is quite as important as their name. The king of the dead may be Hades or Zeus *καταχθόνιος*, Klymenos, Eubouleus, Agesilaos, or Plouton; his wife may be Persephone or Kore, Despoina, Europa, Semele, or Chamyne, or Demeter herself may take this place. At Eleusis we do not know what particular name to attach to the pair *ὁ θεός*, *ἡ θεά*, but there is no doubt that they signify the king and queen of the dead. *πότνιαι σεμναί*, *θεαὶ μεγάλαι*, *δέσποιναι* are frequent names for Demeter and Persephone; evidently the personal name is unimportant (or possibly too sacred for common use), so that some attribute or even the simple *τὼ θεώ* is more common. The only meaning which I attach to this fact is that the chthonic gods were more important for local worship than for a universal mythology.

Again, if we make a distinction between gods of national worship and gods who were the source both of special blessings and of special evils, the chthonic gods, as well as heroes and agricultural gods, will belong to the latter class. The epic presupposed gods who were not angry with their worshipper except on special provocation. Later the connection of the gods with state worship was so intimate, the fortunes of the god were so bound up with the fortunes of the state itself, that it is hardly possible to conceive of a national god as being angry with the state where he was worshipped except in case of gross neglect or insult. Ritual, too, became really a political function performed with pomp and splendor, a part of the inherited life of the state. The question whether or not it was acceptable to the god would not arise, for both god and ritual had become a part of the state life. On the other hand, it was Demeter on whom the growth of the crops depended; some hero who sent a pestilence, in anger at neglect of his worship; Boreas, who destroyed now a hostile, now a friendly fleet. The chthonic gods with all their uncanny associations clearly belong to the latter class of divinities, whose anger is easily roused, but who have the power to send special blessings. At the same time this class is not limited to the chthonic gods, for it includes heroes as well as Olympic divinities who have nothing to do with souls.

Digitized by Google

It is entirely unnecessary for me to quote accounts of the worship of these chthonic gods to prove that they were invested with a mysterious dread just by reason of their connection with souls of the departed. In the fact that they were terrible gods whose anger was easily roused and difficult to allay, we see the reason why these divinities were chosen to protect the sanctity of the oath. Not because they were such ancient gods, but because of their dreaded nature were they invoked in this connection. Perhaps the practice goes back to a period when the souls of the dead were thought to pursue with vengeance the oathbreaker as well as other evil-doers. It is impossible, however, that they should be placed in this association without in turn being influenced by it; as personified curses that were invoked upon the head of the oathbreaker, they were dreaded, not for some mysterious nature, but because they were clothed with all the wishes of evil which were in the minds of those who invoked them. Similarly, the Erinyes were the more dreaded from the very fact that they embodied the vengeance of the murdered man toward the murderer. In a word, the dread nature of these divinities is due to their association with the souls of the dead; but this side of their nature reacts on itself, and is increased by the connections into which it brings them.

Nor can we say with Preller[1] that the awe-inspiring character of these gods was later entirely changed by reason of their connection with agriculture. Agricultural gods, too, were easily roused to anger—for the crops often failed. In such a case their anger must be propitiated; but the shrewd Greek thought it better to anticipate their possible anger and offer them propitiatory sacrifices in advance, before the crops were spoiled. The Homeric Hymn dwells at length on the anger of Demeter. It is not the mild mother-goddess who makes the whole world suffer because she feels she has been wronged. In fact, it would seem that the mildness which we attribute to Demeter was *not* hers in virtue of her being an agricultural goddess; it is a developed trait, due first to the fact that she was elevated from the position of a spirit of the grain to the rank of an Olympian divinity, and secondly to the striking development of the mother-idea in connection with the story of the rape of Persephone. As the heavenly grain-giver, as the divine mother who had lost her

[1] Demeter und Persephone, S. 87 f.

Digitized by Google

daughter and received her back again, she developed those traits which are beautifully expressed in the representations of Demeter in art. In general we may say that agricultural gods as well as chthonic gods, together with certain gods associated with the wilder aspects of nature, belong to one general class, the main characteristic of which is that they are easily roused to anger. The result of this trait was, of course, that men avoided having anything to do with such gods except when it was necessary, and that when it was necessary to approach them, every precaution was taken to soothe their possible anger.

Special blessings also came from chthonic gods. That very connection with the souls of the dead by which they partook of the mysterious and dreaded nature of souls, meant also that they could impart to men a hope of blessedness in the life beyond the grave. The effect of the Eleusinian Mysteries in producing such a hope was based on the fact that the daughter of Demeter was queen of the world of souls. By the mystic worship of soul-gods men might expect favor from these gods after their death.

A scholiast[1] remarks that Hades is never worshipped—and it is true that the god of death is not to be moved or turned aside by any sacrifices. The gods of health were worshipped by men who feared death, not the god of death himself. At the same time Hades-Plouton was not infrequently worshipped at places where there was felt to be some contact with the underworld. Odysseus sacrificed to Hades and Persephone in order to learn the future through the aid of Teiresias. In the later Greek world the Πλουτώνιον was a place where the god of the underworld was worshipped, in order that men might be successful in the citation of souls, and in learning the future from them. So the sick were brought to some of these openings into the realm of Hades, and wonderful cures were wrought on them. These were some of the special blessings which were expected from the gods who ruled over souls of the dead.

Finally, these gods sometimes played the rôle of national deliverers. Persephone several times receives the epithet σώτειρα, and in cases where the meaning of this epithet can be accurately determined, it has to do with the delivery of a nation from the perils of war. Legend assigned a similar office to Demeter in connection with the battles at Salamis and at Plataea; and the

[1] Eustath. ad Iliad. 744, 4; cf. Aisch. Frag. 156.

Digitized by Google

popularity of her worship was correspondingly increased. Moreover, at Elis there was a secret worship of Hades—the temple was entered by the priest alone once a year—because Hades had once appeared to aid the inhabitants of Elis in battle with an invader. In these few instances the chthonic gods perform the distinctive function of heroes.

III.

Turning from the consideration of the nature of the chthonic gods to their worship, we are at once confronted by the suggestion of K. O. Müller, that propitiation has to do only with the chthonic gods.[1] The terminology of Greek sacrifice is very accurate at this point, so that the words used in describing a sacrifice leave no doubt as to its character. With reference to propitiatory sacrifices the first question is whether they are offered to other than chthonic gods; the second consideration is whether sacrifice to chthonic gods always follows the ritual of propitiatory sacrifice, or whether such gods receive the *θυσίαι* proper; and thirdly, I should like to call attention to the fact that certain sacrifices to chthonic gods are really mystic rather than propitiatory or honorary.

1. *Propitiatory sacrifice and libation.*—Propitiatory sacrifices are naturally offered, not to the great national gods of Greece whose life is bound up with that of the peoples they represent, but to the gods whose anger is roused easily and on slight provocation. The result of our study thus far has been to limit the term 'chthonic' somewhat strictly to gods associated with souls of the dead, and to show that the class of gods prone to anger includes several kinds of divinities in addition to the chthonic gods proper. One of the most careful students of Greek religion[2] has written: "Bei der eigentlichen Sühnung gehört das ganze Opfer den Unterirdischen," but the statement seems to me entirely without foundation. If we seek for examples of propitiatory sacrifices or sacrifices with similar rites, which are offered to the chthonic deities proper, very few can be found. I do not find mention of any clear cases of propitiatory sacrifice to Hades or to Persephone, although perhaps the rites described in the Odyssey *κ* and *λ* are based on propitiatory

[1] Cf. the distinction suggested by Porphyry, De ant. nymph. VI, p. 60, 15.

[2] H. Diels, Sibyllinische Blätter, S. 71.

Digitized by Google

sacrifices that were offered to the rulers of the dead by those who wished to obtain oracles from souls of the dead. The gods are στρεπτοί, while Hades alone is ἀμείλιχος ἠδ' ἀδάμαστος, or ἀμείλικτος[1]—such expressions are at variance with any general practice of propitiating the king of the lower world. However, the sacrifice described in the epigram from the Thracian Chersonese (Kaibel, Epigr. Graec. 1034) is distinctly of the propitiatory type, and it seems to me that Euchaites must be a name for Hades, and that ἡ θεά must refer to his bride.

Nor do I find any instances of propitiatory sacrifice offered to Demeter. The nearest approach to anything of the sort is the peculiar sacrifice at Lykosoura described by Pausanias.[2] The act which transforms Demeter Erinys into Demeter Lousia near Thelpousa[3] is not a sacrifice but a bath of reconciling efficacy. So the word ἱλάσκεσθαι in the Homeric hymn to Demeter (vv. 274, 292) has to do with the ὄργια, and has no reference to sacrifices of propitiation such as are offered, e. g., to Apollo.

In Dio Chrysostom and several times in the scholia,[4] rites in the worship of Hekate are said to propitiate the wrath of the goddess. In these rites the blood of dogs was used to purify the superstitious, while the bodies were left at crossroads for Hekate and the 'averting gods.' This is propitiation, but not with ordinary propitiatory sacrifices. The latter type of sacrifice is found, however, in the worship of the Erinyes. At a shrine near Megalopolis men sacrificed (ἐνήγισεν) a black animal to the Eumenides to avert their wrath; similarly we find a ὁλοκαύτωμα of a black sheep at Keryneia, and νυκτίσεμνα δεῖπνα in their worship at Athens.[5]

The result of an examination of *recorded* instances of sacrifice to chthonic gods proper is that practically the only cases of propitiatory sacrifices offered to these gods in Greece are found in the worship of the Erinyes. The chthonic gods, however, i. e. the gods associated with souls, form but a part of a large class of divinities who are easily roused to anger, and to all of these divinities propitiatory sacrifices are necessarily offered. They are offered to agricultural divinities; e. g. to Demeter, Kore, and Zeus

[1] Iliad, I 158; Hom. Hymn. Dem. 259.
[2] Paus. VIII 37, 8.
[3] Paus. VIII 25, 4.
[4] Dio Chrys. IV, p. 168 R; Schol. Aristoph. Ran. 295; Harpocr., s. v. Ἑκάτη.
[5] Paus. VIII 34, 3; Schol. Soph. O. C. 42 from Istros; Aisch. Eum. 108.

Digitized by Google

Bouleus at Mykonos,[1] to Zeus μειλίχιος at Athens,[2] and to Apollo in Ionian regions.[3] They are offered to Apollo to protect the state from possible or present pestilence. Before battle σφάγια were offered, e. g. to Artemis, to allay possible anger of the god. Both annual sacrifices and sacrifices in time of special need were offered to the Winds to allay their wrath and obtain their special favor.[4] Finally, sacrifices of this same general type were offered to souls of the dead. In all these instances the gods who receive these offerings are thought of as able to grant special blessings, while at the same time they are jealous, and prone to anger. They are not all of them gods connected with souls, nor all of them gods connected with the earth, but some of them are distinctly Olympian divinities. To apply the term 'chthonic' to the whole class is to use the term in a way the Greeks did not use it. P. Stengel,[5] in discussing this question, apparently calls *all* the gods who receive such sacrifices, chthonic gods, but he goes on to say that sacrifices to chthonic gods can not be distinguished from propitiatory sacrifices, because the occasion and the mode of offering the sacrifice are the same in each instance. If the rituals of propitiatory sacrifice (to Olympian gods and to chthonic gods) and sacrifice to chthonic gods are the same, it is evidently idle to use the ritual as a test of what gods are to be called 'chthonic' in distinction from 'Olympian'; and there is no foundation for saying that "jeder Gott einen chthonischen Charakter annehmen kann." To say that only gods of the lower regions ever receive propitiatory offerings,[6] is a step still farther from the truth.

'Soothing libations,' μειλίγματα,[7] are to be discussed in this same connection. So far as we know, they form no part of the worship of Demeter or Persephone, of Hekate, or of Hades. They were, however, an important part of the worship of the dead and of the Erinyes. Wine was not used in these libations, and in general the lesser female divinities receive no wine.[8] At this

[1] Bull. Corr. Hell. XII 459 f., l. 16 f. = Dittenberger, S. I. G. 373.

[2] O. Band, Die attischen Diasien, S. 13.

[3] Preller-Robert, Griech. Myth. I 278, A. 1; Mommsen, Feste der Stadt Athen, 470 f.

[4] Stengel, in Hermes, XVI 346 f.

[5] Griech. Sakralalt., S. 87.

[6] Cf. supra, p. 253.

[7] Soph. O. C. 159; Aisch. Eum. 107.

[8] There is no evidence that wine was excluded from the worship of any chthonic god except the Erinyes, and it is entirely unlikely that the θυσία proper

Digitized by Google

point there is perhaps to be noted a difference between expiatory rites and the worship of certain chthonic gods; the libation is important to appease the Erinyes, but in general it forms no part of propitiatory sacrifice.

2. *Purification and mystic sacrifice.*—The use of blood, the blood of a sucking pig, as the most potent purifier, has been confidently explained as expressing the substitution of an animal's life for the life of a guilty man.[1] Many forms of purification, especially for murder, admit of this explanation. It does not so readily apply to purification before marriage, or before sharing the mysteries, nor, indeed, to the purification of an assembly-hall. In these instances it can hardly be forgotten that the pig is sacred to Demeter, and her favorite sacrifice. The use of a pig's blood can hardly be other than the use of the blood of a sacred animal to produce a mystic connection with the divinity. The result, then, would be such a consecration of the person to the god as will protect the man from the god's anger, and from all consequences of this anger. If this be the case, we may assume a contamination of other rites of purification, such that the use of a pig's blood, which belongs to the worship of Demeter, is extended to other cases in which men seek to remove the cause of some god's anger. This explanation of purification is strengthened by the fact that the blood of the animal sacred to Hekate, the dog, is used for purification in rites connected with the worship of Hekate. Insofar as purificatory rites should be explained in this manner, we are dealing, not with cleansings proper, nor with substitution, but with what I should term 'mystic sacrifices,' sacrifices which produce a mystic connection between the worshipper and his god for the benefit of the worshipper. The idea of mystic sacrifices has been so fully exploited in recent years by English students of the history of religion that it needs no explanation. An example[2] is sufficient. At the shrine of Apollo Δειραδιώτης "the προφήτης is a woman to whom marriage is for-

was offered to chthonic gods without wine. It is therefore needless to assume an unchanging cultus of these gods from a period before wine was introduced into Greece; nor can we say with Stengel (Griech. Sakralalt., S. 86) that wine is excluded from this cultus on the ground that it was the joy-giving drink of living men.

[1] Stengel, Griech. Sakralalt., S. 88 f.; Diels, Sibyll. Blätter, S. 69.

[2] Paus. II 24, 1.

Digitized by Google

bidden. Each month a lamb is sacrificed at night, and when the woman tastes its blood she becomes possessed of the god." Stengel[1] calls this a *Sühnopfer*, but it has absolutely nothing to do with propitiation. The cults of Artemis and probably some other cults of Apollo furnish even better examples of mystic sacrifice, but I have selected this because of Stengel's reference to it. If it did not lead too far from my subject, I should like to show how Diels' argument for regarding expiatory sacrifices as based on substitution can be applied *mutatis mutandis* to show that expiatory sacrifice originated in a form of mystic sacrifice.

So far as we know, the worship of Hades included no mystic sacrifices. As for Demeter and Persephone, the only sacrifice of this type occurs when the sacred animal, the pig, is used to 'purify' the worshipper. It requires, however, but a slight extension of the word 'mystic' to make it apply to many of the rites in the worship of Demeter. The only objection to such a use of it lies in the fact that in the worship of Demeter the worshipper does not become possessed of the god, ἔνθεος, as in the more wild phases of the worship of Dionysos. In the worship of Demeter men see the experiences of the goddesses acted, or at least suggested by visible symbols—they even imitate themselves the acts of the goddess, till they come to share her feelings. It is not so much that a divine spirit enters into them, as that they feel themselves sharing the yearning, the sadness, and the anger of Demeter, and her boundless joy when Persephone is restored, until at length they enter into the very life of the goddess and can look forward with confident hope to a blessed life after death, under the divine protection. The word 'mystic' may be discarded, still the idea of this worship is much the same as the idea of mystic sacrifice, and it is the most characteristic development in the worship of chthonic gods. Many sacrifices to Hekate are clearly of this mystic type. There is a story that Hekate was a woman whom Artemis changed into a dog, and sacrifices of dogs to her can only be explained[2] on the supposition that the dog was her sacred animal. As such its blood was smeared on those who needed purification, to consecrate them to the goddess. The character of other ὄργια in her worship we do not know.

[1] Griech. Kultusalt., S. 92, and A. 12.

[2] We can hardly explain this fact on the ground of the natural antipathy of dogs to the moon, as does Preller (Demeter und Persephone, S. 208, A. 57).

Digitized by Google

3. *Honorary worship.*—The two types of worship that have already been considered correspond to the special characteristics of that general class of divinities which includes the chthonic gods. These divinities are prone to anger, so that they are approached with fear and receive sacrifices that are intended to propitiate their anger. They also have special blessings to bestow, and in order to obtain these blessings men employ those sacrifices which produce a mystic union with these gods. At the same time, they are not so clearly differentiated from the other gods as not to receive the ordinary types of sacrifice.

In 1894 Stengel wrote of the chthonic gods: "Hier gab es keine Speiseopfer"[1]; the next year this statement was modified.[2] As a matter of fact, the *Speiseopfer* is more clearly proved for chthonic gods than is the *Sühnopfer*. E. g. at Megalopolis[3] there was a double worship of the Erinyes: black animals (sheep) were first sacrificed (ἐναγίζεται) to them, and this was followed by a θυσία, a communion meal, of white animals. We have no reason to think that the θυσία which was offered to these goddesses at Athens by those acquitted of murder[4] was other than a festal communion meal. The sacrifice to Zeus chthonios and Ge chthonia at Mykonos is to be eaten, δαινύσθων αὐτοῦ, and so, probably, is the sacrifice to Semele mentioned in the same inscription. So the sacrifice to Zeus Sosipolis at Magnesia for blessings on the crops is in no sense a propitiatory sacrifice. We know almost nothing in detail of the sacrifices offered to Demeter and Persephone. The technical terms of propitiatory sacrifice—ἐναγίζειν, ἔντομα, σφάγια, μειλίγματα, πέλανος—are not, so far as I know, applied to sacrifices offered to Demeter. Moreover, we do know that offerings to Demeter, Persephone, and Eubouleus are mentioned in Eleusinian inscriptions[5] in the same series with offerings to Athena, so that it is fair to regard them as all of the same character. The Eleusinian goddesses are called χθόνιαι by Herodotos, and their worship has a distinct reference to the future life, so that these sacrifices at Eleusis may fairly be classed as examples of true θυσία in the worship of chthonic gods.

I will refer to but one other type of worship, the θεοξένιον or *lectisternium.*[6] This is best known in the worship of the Dios-

[1] Hermes, XXIX 286.
[2] Festschrift für L. Friedländer, S. 41.
[3] Paus. VIII 34, 3.
[4] Paus. I 28, 6.
[5] Dittenberger, S. I. G. 13; cf. also C. I. A. II 1, 628; IV 2, 385 d 13, p. 103.
[6] Rohde, Psyche, S. 121, A. 2.

Digitized by Google

kouroi, and in the worship of Apollo at Delphi. It appears elsewhere in the worship of heroes, as well as in the worship of gods of agriculture.[1] Now, it so happens that the single instance where we have precise knowledge as to the worship of Plouton is at Athens. Three inscriptions of much the same content direct that the hierophant prepare a couch for Plouton, and spread the table for him according to the oracle[2]; i. e. Plouton was worshipped with the θεοξένιον as well as with the θυσία. Possibly we should find a reference to the same type of worship in some inscriptions from Mantinea[3] which describe a peculiar λητουργία in the service of Demeter. Some woman, not one of the college of priests, invites the goddess to her house; a procession conducts thither the goddess, in the person of her image, and she is richly entertained; later the procession is feasted at the expense of the woman who undertakes the service.

We have found that, so far as the accounts of sacrifice at our disposal are concerned, expiatory sacrifices and libations are offered to the Erinyes, but not to other chthonic gods. We have seen, secondly, that one form of mystic worship is characteristic of the rites of Demeter, Persephone, and Hekate, and that purification seems to be connected with such mystic worship. And, thirdly, we find evidence that the *lectisternium*, as well as the θυσία proper, is offered to chthonic gods in the same way that they are offered to Olympian deities. The conclusion is unavoidable that we are not justified in describing any one type of worship as distinctly chthonic. Even the rule that black animals are used in this worship has many exceptions. The forms of worship correspond with the character of the gods. The banquet-sacrifice is the normal form of sacrifice in the case of the greater gods whose worship is carried on by the state. Gods connected with souls, i. e. chthonic gods in the narrower sense of the term, belong to a class of gods who are easily roused to anger and who have special blessings to bestow, and in the worship of these gods propitiatory sacrifice and mystic sacrifice are the commoner forms of worship.

ARTHUR FAIRBANKS.

[1] Cf. the reference to a couch prepared for Zeus Sosipolis in the long inscription about his worship at Magnesia.

[2] C. I. A. II 948–50.

[3] Lebas-Foucart, 352 h and i.

Digitized by Google

II.—NOTES ON CICERO'S USE OF THE IMPERFECT AND PLUPERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE IN *SI*-CLAUSES.

Our traditional classification of *si*-clauses according to the mood and tense of the verb of the clause tends, perhaps, to distract attention from some other important features of the conditional sentence. It is the purpose of this paper to point out and illustrate some of the too much neglected or quite unnoticed characteristics of the *si*-clause. The observations are based upon a study of the independent subjunctive and of the imperfect and pluperfect subjunctive in *si*-clauses, as found in Cicero's Orations. The present paper deals only with those conditional sentences which have either the imperfect or pluperfect subjunctive in both protasis and apodosis[1]: these will be referred to by the tenses found in each member; thus imperfect-imperfect form means imperfect in both protasis and apodosis, imperfect-pluperfect form means imperfect in protasis and pluperfect in apodosis, etc., the first member of the compound name describing in every case the protasis, and the second member, the apodosis.

I. *Stress or Emphasis.*

It is a well-recognized fact that the words of a sentence are not all spoken with the same degree of intensity, but that those which connote ideas that are uppermost in the mind of the speaker receive a corresponding stress in utterance. This principle is not confined to one language, and is as true of a conditional clause as of any other syntactical combination. We are so familiar with the play of emphasis that we usually do not consciously appreciate it, but it requires very little observation to see that phrases differ very much in the distribution of their stress and its relative intensity.

A prime factor in logical, and therefore in stress, prominence is antithesis; for instance, one teacher might say to another, 'You have a poor class this year, I suppose'; the other replies, 'No, I

[1] Sentences that are involved in other constructions, e. g. indirect discourse, are not included; the same is true of questions, which may have an independent subjunctive in the apodosis. The total number of cases treated is about 500.

Digitized by Google

have a very *good* class this year.' In the idea behind the reply, *good* stands out in antithesis to *poor*, and therefore in utterance the word *good*, reinforced by *very*, has the sentence-accent. How strong this mental prominence is, may be inferred from the fact that had the second person replied, 'No, a very *good* one,' his meaning would have been perfectly clear. This optional suppression of subject and verb can only mean that the ideas they connote are an accessory part of the thought—that its essential feature is the new conception *good*, which is in sharp contrast to *poor* (whereas the conceptions that do not find expression are a virtual repetition of those of the first speaker). These principles have an important bearing on the conditional sentence.

Of all varieties of *si*-clause, perhaps the unreal condition is the one in which sharp antitheses may most logically be expected; for, in its very essence, the unreal condition is an opposition to some reality clearly before the speaker's mind—no Roman, for instance, could have said 'si Romae Caesar esset' without having clearly in mind that Caesar was at some other definite place (as the position of Romae might lead us to assume), or, at least, that he was away from Rome. The following sentences show the working of antithesis:

in Cat. I 7. 17: *Servi* mehercule *mei* si me isto pacto metuerent, ut te metuunt omnes *cives tui*, domum meam relinquendam putarem.

de Har. Resp. 8. 16: Quae quidem ego si aut *per me* aut *ab aliis* haberem, non praedicarem apud vos, ne . . .: sed cum sint mihi data a *vobis*, . . . non . . . vereor . . .

de Leg. Agr. II 3. 6: Quodsi *solus* in discrimen aliquod adducerer, ferrem, Quirites, animo aequiore.

p. Clu. 29. 80: At *tum* si dicerem, non audirer, non quod alia res esset: immo eadem, sed tempus aliud.

In the third example cited, *solus* is followed by *vos universos*, and in the fourth *tum* is preceded by *nunc*; in the other cases the contrasted words are within the limits of the passage; in two cases the stressed word or words precede *si*.

It will be at once noted that in no case does the stress fall upon the *verb* of the *si*-clause; applying the principles set forth above it follows that *the verb is not necessarily the expression of the essence of a condition.*[1] Any doubt of the soundness of the

[1] For like cases see in Verr. II 1. 17. 44, II 3. 1. 3, II 5. 58. 150, in Cat. II 6. 12, p. Scauro 1. 10, Phil. I 7. 18, X 8. 16, X 10. 20.

Digitized by Google

reasoning may be dispelled by a closer inspection; e. g. de Leg. Agr. II 3. 6 (cited above) has *solus* as the stressed word of its *si*-clause—stressed because it is the expression of the essential feature of the clause—namely, unreality;—if that one word were cut out and the verb were left to express the idea of unreality, it would reverse the meaning of the clause and make nonsense of the passage; for it is one thing to say, 'If I were going into danger,' implying I am not, and quite another to say, 'If I *alone* were going into danger,' implying that not only I but others are going. In the latter case the unreality of the clause is not inherent in the verbal idea of going (into danger), for the speaker *is* going, but rather in the manner of the going—'alone' as contrasted with 'in the company of others.'

The last passage cited (p. Clu. 29. 80) illustrates the same point, for the unreality is not the *speaking* (*dicerem*), but its *time* or *circumstances*; *tum* refers to a definite time some years past, and with it we might have expected the pluperfect tense: it would seem, then, that *tum* stands for two elements, unreality and time—the first by virtue of its emphasis, the second by virtue of its signification. As we might say in English, 'If I were living in the Middle Ages': here the stress and meaning of the temporal expression allow the whole phrase to take the form of simple unreality instead of that of opposition to past reality.

It is to be observed that the stress may fall upon any element of the sentence—now the subject (e. g. in Cat. I 7. 17), now an adjunct of the verb. Further examples may be found in the passages cited in the last footnote.

If there be need of further evidence to show that the verb is not necessarily the essential part of a *si*-clause, it may be found in the following considerations:—

in Verr. II 1. 17. 44: nihil dicam nisi singulare, nisi id, quod si in *alium* reum diceretur, incredibile videretur.

In this sentence the verb *diceretur* plays a very weak rôle, for it is already implied in *dicam* above; hence, though it may sound a little crude, the same thought might have found expression in quod in *alium* reum incredibile videretur.[1]

In point of fact, just such shortened conditional sentences form a well-recognized class in Latin. Such sentences, though simple

[1] Other like examples are—
in Verr. II 5. 58. 150: si haec *apud Scythas* dicerem.
Phil. X 8. 16: si *ipse* viveret *C. Caesar*.

Digitized by Google

in form, by an emphatic word or phrase imply a condition, and hence perform the function of a complex sentence.

p. Q. Rosc. 17. 50: vix me dius fidius tu, Fanni, *a Ballione* aut aliquo eius simili hoc ex postulare auderes et impetrare posses; i. e. 'If you were dealing with a Ballio or his like.'

This sentence is merely an extreme case of the kind of formally complex sentence with which we have all along been dealing—namely, one whose conditional clause does not stress its verb; this takes the one essential word of the condition and incorporates it into the main clause.[1] Cicero has left us a pair of sentences which express a similar thought, but use in one case the full form, in the other the abbreviated:

Phil. X 10. 20: Ita praeclara est recuperatio libertatis, ut ne *mors* quidem sit in repetenda libertate fugienda. *Quodsi immortalitas consequeretur praesentis periculi fugam*, tamen eo magis ea fugienda videretur, quo diuturnior servitus esset.

Cicero is speaking of the readiness of other nations to endure anything rather than risk their remnant of life, and says that even immortality would be no boon at such a price.

p. Plancio 37. 90: *Mortem* me timuisse dicis. Ego vero ne *immortalitatem* quidem contra rem publicam accipiendam putarem, nedum . . .

In these sentences the conditional idea centers in *immortalitas* and *immortalitatem*, and it would seem that Cicero could have used either form he chose in the expression of each of the ideas. The first sentence in the short form might run, '*Endless life* even (to say nothing of our brief span) would be a poor reward of cowardice, for it would mean only a longer slavery'; the second, expanded, might read, 'If endless life (and not a brief span) were at stake, I would not think of accepting it, etc.'

It is hard to escape the conclusion that these two sentences are essentially alike, and, if so, that the preservation of the noun in the

[1] This short form would be clear to the hearer only in case the other elements of the sentence are sufficiently implied in what precedes; hence it is out of the question when the conditional clause is in antithesis to what is to follow, as de Leg. Agr. II 3. 6 (cited above): Quodsi solus in discrimen aliquod adducerer, ferrem, Quirites, animo aequiore; sed mihi videntur certi homines . . . *vos universos* . . . *vituperaturi*. If, on the other hand, he had wished to say, 'We are all running into danger,' he might have followed that by '*Alone*, I would not mind it,' and still made his thought clear. As it is, though the verb (as shown above) is not the main feature of the clause, it needs to be expressed for clearness.

Digitized by Google

short form shows that it (and not the suppressed elements) contains the essence of the thought.[1] The bearing of this upon the main proposition, that the verb does not necessarily contain the essence of a condition, is obvious.

The propositions then maintained under this heading are: (*a*) the verb is not always the essential part of a *si*-clause; (*b*) *si*-clauses which stress some word other than the verb are closely allied to that form of sentence, complex in function but simple in form, which by a single word represents the essence of a condition.

These observations may be applied to the following passage:

p. Rab. Perd. 5. 15: nisi forte hanc condicionem vobis esse vultis, quam *servi*, si libertatis spem propositam non haberent, ferre nullo modo possent.

In this sentence *servi* plays the part of a *si*-clause, and the formal *si*-clause is a proviso: '. . . a state of affairs which, were *slaves* (not we) concerned, would be intolerable, in case no hope of freedom were held out.'

II. *A Peculiar Variety of the Imperfect-Pluperfect Form.*

The imperfect-pluperfect form is the least used of the four, in the Orations; 41 cases are found, the majority of which claim discussion under another heading. The present discussion deals with those cases which have the imperfect subjunctive in protasis opposed to a definitely past reality, e. g. something that occurred in the lives of people long since dead; nine such cases were noted, as well as the fact that they have a common characteristic in function, which may explain the use of the tense. Four cases will be quoted in full, and along with them three cases of the pluperfect-pluperfect form for purposes of comparison:—

p. Mil. 17. 45: . . . quos clamores, nisi ad cogitatum facinus *adproperaret*, numquam reliquisset.

[1] The same shortening of form may be observed in English. Some one comes to visit a sick friend and says, 'If you *were well*, we would climb the mountain to-day'; the stress is here upon the verbal idea, which is in antithesis to *sickness*. A few minutes later, with a changed point of view, the friend might say, 'If *John* were sick, he would not complain as *you* do'; now the antithesis is different: sickness and health are not the things uppermost in the speaker's mind, but the diverse conduct of two people under like circumstances is; hence the stress on *John*. Suppose the last sentence had been simply, '*John* would not complain as you do': the emphatic word that marks the antithesis performs the function of a conditional clause.

Digitized by Google

p. Mil. 10. 27: . . . quam (contionem), nisi obire facinoris locum tempusque *voluisset*, numquam reliquisset.

p. Mur. 14. 32: quo (i. e. to war) ille, cum esset . . . talis . . ., numquam . . . esset profectus, si cum mulierculis bellandum *arbitraretur*. Neque vero cum P. Africano senatus egisset ut . . . proficisceretur, . . . nisi illud grave bellum . . . *putaretur*.

p. Mur. 16. 34: si bellum hoc, si hic hostis . . . contemnendus *fuisset*, neque tanta cura senatus . . . suscipiendum putasset, neque tot annos gessisset . . .

in Verr. II 5. 51. 133: . . . tuus hospes Cleomenes hoc dicit, sese in terram esse egressum, ut . . . milites colligeret, quos in navibus collocaret: quod certe non fecisset, si suum numerum naves *haberent*.

Phil. III 3. 6: reliquit consulem: quod profecto non fecisset, si eum consulem *iudicasset*, quem . . .

Cp. p. Plancio 22. 53, p. Arch. 7. 16; also in Verr. II 3. 39. 89, II 3. 58. 134, p. Cael. 6. 14.

It will be noted that the examples quoted in full are arranged in pairs, imperfect-pluperfect forms being joined in each case with a pluperfect-pluperfect form: the first pair refer to the *same* time and event, in words almost identical, the other pairs refer to *like* situations, so far as time is concerned.

All nine sentences of the imperfect-pluperfect form now under discussion have a peculiarity that may be illustrated by p. Mur. 14. 32 (quoted above). Cicero is showing that a war with Eastern nations is not a thing to be despised, and says, 'to which war he (Cato) would never have gone, if he had believed he was to fight with weaklings,' referring to the war with Antiochus. This sentence is used as a *logical instrument*: it is a matter of history that Cato did go to the war, and Cicero adduces that fact to prove that Cato believed the foe worthy of his steel. Compare the following sentences:

(*a*) If Rome were a small city (opposed to a well-known fact), it would fall an easy prey to the Gauls.

(*b*) It rained last night; for the flowers would not be so fresh, if it had not rained last night.

The Latin sentences under discussion are like the latter of these. The difference between the English sentences is this: in the first the prøtasis is unreal beyond question and is the starting-point of the sentence; in the second the apodosis is unreal beyond question, and its unreality is the thing that establishes

Digitized by Google

the unreality of the protasis—which last is the aim and purpose of the sentence. The thought underlying is really in the form of syllogism; e. g., p. Mur. 14. 32 (explained above) implies some such reasoning as this:

(1) Cato was not a man to go to war against a foe unworthy his steel.

(2) He went to the war against Antiochus.

(3) Therefore he thought the war no easy work.

This scores a point in favor of Cicero's contention that an Eastern war is an important undertaking. In accordance with its function, I venture to apply to this type of conditional sentence the name 'inferential'.[1] It will be found that this usage is marked by *enim*, *certe*, *profecto* and *numquam* (in its sense of emphatic negation); however, these particles are not confined to this usage, and their mere presence is no indication that the sentence is inferential: the real test is, does the unreality of the protasis need proof, and is the speaker trying to establish its validity? If so, the cases are genuine.

If this peculiar usage, found in all the cases, is the reason for the use of the imperfect subjunctive where opposition to a definite past is intended, it may have come about in this way: the essence of inferential sentences of the form under discussion is, 'this or that would (or would not) have happened, if (or unless) *it were true that* . . .'; that is, the thing the speaker is anxious to establish is *the unreality of the protasis*, and may therefore choose the form of simple unreality, letting the consideration of a time-element take a subordinate place; this is tentative, of course, but seems a reasonable explanation.

If the cases given at the beginning of this topic be examined, it will be seen that the sentences of the pluperfect-pluperfect form have this same inferential force: there seems to be no other formal difference between these and those of the imperfect-pluperfect form than the tense of the verb, nor any difference of function. If that be the fact, then the choice of tense must be a

[1] The latest edition of Harkness' Grammar cites a solitary case of this sort, Cic. Brutus 10. 40, assigning the original tense-force of the imperfect as explanation: nec tamen dubito quin habuerit vim magnam semper oratio. Neque enim . . . tantum laudis in dicendo Ulixi tribuisset Homerus et Nestori, . . . nisi iam tum *esset* honos eloquentiae, neque ipse . . . orator fuisset. This is quite like the cases now being dealt with, and comes in for a share of the same explanation. Cp. Goodwin, Greek Moods and Tenses, §412.

Digitized by Google

purely subjective matter, the pluperfect-pluperfect form preserving the normal tense-distinction, and the imperfect-pluperfect form allowing the time-element to slip into the background under the stress of another conception; this explanation of the workings of subjectivity is, of course, also tentative.

III. *Use of Tenses.*

The unreal conditional sentence employs a set of forms which no longer have the tense-force proper to them, but lend themselves to the expression of a new category, i. e. unreality. Despite this lack of proper tense-force, such sentences can be given a quasi-temporal classification according to the time-relations of the realities to which they are opposed; these, of course, have normal temporal relations, and, as it were, reflect these on the conditions and conclusions opposed to them. Two tense-forms then, the imperfect and pluperfect, bear the reflected light of various sorts of realities: the present discussion will deal with these.

A. *Imperfect Subjunctive.*

In this tense will be found correspondences to

(*a*) *A General Truth.*—p. Caec. 18. 53: Voluntas, quae si tacitis nobis intellegi posset, verbis omnino non uteremur.

p. Clu. 50. 139: Nam si causae ipsae pro se loqui possent, nemo adhiberet oratorem.

p. Arch. 11. 29: Certe, si nihil animus praesentiret in posterum . . . , nec tantis se laboribus frangeret neque . . . dimicaret.

(*b*) *A Fact Somewhat Time-limited but not Confined to the Immediate Present.*—p. Sex. Rosc. 30. 83: Nam si mihi liberet accusare, accusarem alios potius, ex quibus possem crescere.

p. Quinct. 1. 1: Neque hoc tanto opere querendum videretur haec summa in illis esse, si in nobis essent saltem mediocria.

These protases refer to Cicero's ability or attitude, and need not be restricted to the time of speaking, yet they are, in the nature of things, time-limited. Cp. p. Quinct. 27. 85, in Cat. I 7. 17.

(*c*) *An Immediate Present.*—p. Font. 15. 34: Si M. Fonteium, iudices, *in causa* deficerent omnia, si turpi adulescentia . . . in iudicium vocaretur, . . . esset vobis magnopere providendum, ne . . .

Digitized by Google

in Verr. II 2. 73. 180: Si illi . . . *nunc* idem in eum judices essent, istum sine dubio condemnarent . . .

These protases refer to the time of the law-cases in which Cicero is at the time engaged. Cf. p. Sex. Rosc. 51. 149. In practice this seems often regarded as the normal signification of the imperfect subjunctive: in point of fact examples are rather hard to find.

(*d*) *A Historical Present.*—p. Sulla 13. 36 and 38: Si *respondisset* idem sentire et secum facere Sullam, tamen mihi non videretur in hunc id criminosum esse debere . . . 'Non purgat' inquit. Dixi antea: ne si *argueret* quidem tum denique cum esset interrogatus, id mihi criminosum videretur.

In these two passages Cicero is speaking of the same past event, and the sudden change from pluperfect to imperfect can hardly be accounted for except on the hypothesis that the historical present between the two passages influences the latter. A historical present precedes and follows p. Sest. 64. 134. Cp. in Verr. II 2. 40. 99 and possibly II 3. 20. 52, II 3. 56. 129: the last two are inferential in function, and the tense of their protases may come under that explanation.

It will be noted that the time-relations reflected are those of the present indicative. The examples given illustrate the use in protasis: classes (*a*), (*b*) and (*c*) might be illustrated in the same way in apodosis; no case of (*d*) was noted.

This tense has still another use in unreal conditions—namely, opposition to a future;—this is reserved for special treatment and may for convenience be classed with (*c*) for the present.

B. *Pluperfect Subjunctive.*

In the use of this tense there will be found correspondences to

(1) *A Preterite.*—in Verr. II 2. 56. 139: *Postero anno* L. Metellus mentionem tui census fieri vetat: . . . Hoc si tuus inimicus fecisset, tamen . . . iudicium grave videretur.

p. Quinct. 9. 33: . . . quod *hesterno die* fecerunt . . .: quam rem facile a praetore impetrassent, nisi . . . docuisses. In the context is found the definite past time referred to. Cp. in Verr. II 2. 57. 140, Phil. II 15. 37; and for the same use in apodosis, Phil. II 11. 26.

(2) *A True Perfect.*—p. Mur. 13. 29: In qua (i. e. an orator's skill) si satis profecissem, parcius de eius laude dicerem: i. e. 'If I had up to this time attained and now had.'

Digitized by Google

p. Sulla 7. 22: Nisi tu, inquit, causam recepisses, numquam mihi restitisset, sed . . .

For a similar use in apodosis see Phil. II 36. 90, X 4. 9.

Throughout the rest of this discussion I should like to refer to the uses of the imperfect as (*a*), (*b*) and (*c*), indicating (as above) opposition to a general truth, to a reality somewhat time-limited but not confined to the immediate present, and to an immediate present; and to the uses of the pluperfect as (1) and (2), indicating opposition to a preterite and a true perfect.

The distinctions that have just been made on the basis of the time of the realities opposed may be applied to the solution of a problem that at first sight appears difficult—namely, to assign a reason why the imperfect-pluperfect form should exhibit only 41 cases and the pluperfect-imperfect 132.

Nine of the 41 cases of imperfect-pluperfect form have already been disposed of as inferential: of the remaining 32[1] most are of the form (*a*) or (*b*)+(1) or (2), and one or two have the form (*c*)+(2); (*c*)+(1) is conspicuously absent, and herein lies at least part of the reason for the numerical disparity noted above.[2] The meaning of the formulae given in the last sentence is this: (*a*) or (*b*)+(1) means a more or less general unreality, paired with an opposition to concrete past reality, e. g.:

Phil. II 28. 70: Nam si dignitas significaretur in nomine, dixisset, credo, aliquando avus tuus se et consulem et Antonium.

Just as we may say in English, 'If I *had* not the greatest confidence in you, I should have been very much frightened.' The justification for such sentences is of course that the more or less general unreality is opposed to a reality that extends into the past as well as covers the immediate present. (*a*) or (*b*)+(2) is a still easier combination, for (2) is opposed to a reality that extends from the past up to and includes the present: such a case may be

[1] The list is: p. Quinct. 14. 46; p. Sex. Rosc. 26. 72; in Verr. I 2. 5, II 1. 53. 139, II 1. 57. 150, II 2. 1. 3, II 2. 24. 58, II 2. 40. 99, II 2. 52. 130, II 3. 64. 150, II 3. 92. 215; p. Font. 18. 40; p. Clu. 66. 189; p. Rab. Perd. 6. 18; in Cat. I 12. 29, II 2. 3; p. Mur. 4. 8, 8. 17, 23. 46; p. Flac. 5. 11; post red. in sen. 14. 34; de dom. 51. 132; p. Sest. 20. 45; p. Cael. 29. 69; p. Planc. 17. 43; p. Deio. 9. 25; Phil. II 2. 3, II 28. 70, V 1. 1, VI 3. 6, XIII 13. 28; p. Mil. 23. 61.

[2] An attempt to form a sentence of the imperfect-pluperfect type on the norm (*c*)+(1) will show the limitations of that type; e. g. 'If you were well *to-day*, we would have climbed the mountains *yesterday*.' The reason that this form of sentence is avoided, is obvious.

Digitized by Google

Phil. V 1. 1: ... sic me perturbasset ejus sententia ... nisi vestrae virtuti constantiaeque confiderem, i. e. 'I should have been disturbed and should now be so.'

(*c*)+(2) would be explained by the same elastic use of the pluperfect.

p. Mur. 23. 46: Sed tota illa lex accusationem tuam, si haberes nocentem reum, fortasse armasset.

This securing of logical exactness only by the elastic meaning of one or both members gives a feeling that the imperfect-pluperfect form had no very special mission to perform, but is a sort of weak variety of the imperfect-imperfect and pluperfect-pluperfect forms. In pleasing contrast is the rugged strength of the pluperfect-imperfect form: it is opposed to realities related as cause and effect which work from past to present, and hence uses pluperfect and imperfect in their narrowest significations freely; e. g.:

Phil. II 15. 37: *Quo* quidem *tempore*, si ... meum consilium ... valuisset, tu *hodie* egeres ... Cf. Phil. III 1. 2, IV 1. 1.

As we might say in English, 'If I had taken better care of myself that winter ten years ago, I should be in better health to-day,' i. e. 'I neglected my health ten years ago, and *therefore* suffer now.' These two sentences are of the form (1)+(*c*), expressing opposition to a definite past and a definite present. I think that the mission of the pluperfect-imperfect form to express opposition to these causal connections will be found one of the causes of its more frequent use.

IV. *Si-Concessive.*

The use of *si*-concessive is very frequent in the Orations: 72 cases have their apodosis marked by *tamen*[1]—a very large number when it is considered that the total number of cases treated is less than 500. This number might be swelled a little by the addition of other cases that have concessive force but are not marked by *tamen*.[2]

de prov. cons. 20. 47: Ego, si essent inimicitiae mihi cum C. Caesare, *tamen* hoc tempore rei publicae consulere ... deberem.

[1] Distributed as follows: imperfect-imperfect form, 43 (of total 214); imperfect-pluperfect, 4 (of 41); pluperfect-imperfect, 20 (of 108); pluperfect-pluperfect, 5 (of 132).

[2] in Verr. II 4. 31. 70, p. Sulla 13. 38 (ne ... quidem), de prov. cons. 5. 10, p. Sest. 12. 28, 29. 62 (nihilo minus), Phil. I 8. 20.

Digitized by Google

in Caecil. 19. 61: Ego, si superior ceteris rebus esses, hanc unam ob causam te . . . repudiari putarem oportere.

If the last case be examined, it will appear that the apodosis is not unreal; if it were, it would make Cicero imply that he did not think Caecilius should be rejected for this one cause: on the contrary, he means to say that he *does* think so, and *would still* do so even were there mitigating circumstances; that, in general, is the force of the apodosis in this use.

Though the *si*-clause itself seems to suffer no change when used to express concession, so far as form is concerned, it would not be unnatural to suppose that a speaker could prepare his hearer for the kind of apodosis that was to follow; in English we do this by the *tone of voice*, e. g.:

(1) If I were *rich*, I should not be as saving as I am.

(2) If I were *rich*, I should still be as saving as I am.

If these sentences are read with a view to bringing out the thought clearly, it will be found that the stress in each condition falls on the word *rich*, but that the *tone* in which it is pronounced varies.

Figures are not at hand to make possible a comparison of the frequency of this concessive use, in the Orations and other styles; apparently the proportion is large here, and, if so, it may be due to the fact that the sentences are to be *spoken*: this gives a chance for the element of tone to enter. On the written page, as said above, we get no clue to the meaning of the *si*-clause till the apodosis is reached.

V. *Verb-meaning.*

Verbs of *action* in the imperfect tense will be discussed under this heading.

A. *In Protasis.*

It will be remembered that three main classes of reality are opposed by the imperfect subjunctive; (*a*) general truth, (*b*) a reality somewhat time-limited, and (*c*) a reality of the immediate present. To render these into English we have two forms at our disposal, 'if they talked' and 'if they were talking'; (*a*) and (*b*) are correctly translated by the first of these; e. g. 'if men talked less, they would less often get into trouble' and 'if I talked for my own ends, my audiences would be smaller'.[1] Class (*c*) sometimes can be rendered by the second English form:

[1] The second English form would be possible for this last.

Digitized by Google

p. Deio. 2. 6: Hanc enim causam, C. Caesar, si in foro dicerem, . . . quantam mihi alacritatem populi Romani concursus adferret!

Here the idea of action is almost merged into that of a state, hence we may render 'if I *were speaking* in the Forum.'

Aside from such cases, one has the feeling that verbs of action in protases of Class (*c*) do not fit into the category of unreality in the same natural way that the verbs do which denote a state.

p. Quinct. 26. 81: Si enim illud diceres, improbe mentiri viderere.

in Verr. II 3. 72. 169: Si hercle te tuam pecuniam praetorem in provincia faeneratum docerem, tamen effugere non posses.

p. Mur. 3. 5: Etenim, si largitionem factam esse confiterer idque recte factum esse defenderem, facerem improbe . . .

p. Rab. Post. 7. 18: Si iam vobis nuntiaretur in senatu sententias dici, ut his legibus teneremini, concurrendum ad curiam putaretis; si lex de ea re ferretur, convolaretis ad rostra.

p. Mil. 28. 77: Quam ob rem, si cruentum gladium tenens clamaret T. Annius . . .: esset vero timendum, quonam modo id ferret civitas.

The Latin is consistent in holding these sentences down to the unreal form, but I think an English speaker with the same ideas to express would choose a different form; e. g. the last case cited might be rendered 'if Milo *were to take* a bloody sword and cry aloud . . .' (implying that he is doing no such thing and is unlikely to do it); the preceding example might be rendered 'if it *should be announced* to you' (vague supposition).[1] The Latin too shows some indication that a future idea is not far removed from these verbs of action in protasis:

in Verr. II 1. 17. 44: nihil *dicam* . . . nisi id, quod si in alium reum *diceretur*, incredibile videretur.

in Caecil. 13. 43: Ac si tibi nemo *responsurus esset*, tamen ipsam causam . . . demonstrare non posses.

In the first case the time is set by *dicam*: Cicero is simply telling what he is *going to say*, and *diceretur must* reflect the time of *dicam*.[2] It may be remembered that when Class (*c*) was first

[1] A really remarkable case of this sort may be found in p. Caec. 30. 88, where Cicero uses a full conditional sentence in a simile, strangely enough choosing the unreal form where we certainly would use the other.

[2] It has already been shown that the essence of this clause lies in *alium*; the unreality implied by this word may help in holding the verb down to the unreal form.

Digitized by Google

defined it was made large enough to include such cases as this, opposed to a future.

Latin may be said, then, to be a little more conservative than the English in holding to the unreal form.

B. *In Apodosis.*

Here the verbs of action are clearly opposed to a future, as shown by the following defined cases[1]:

p. Sex. Rosc. 30. 83: Neque enim id *facerem* nisi necesse esset, et id *erit* signi me invitum facere, quod non *persequar* longius quam salus huius et mea fides *postulabit.*

p. Rab. Perd. 6. 19: Lubenter, inquam, confiterer, si vere possem . . .; sed, quoniam id facere non possum, *confitebor* id, quod . . .

p. Sulla 1. 2: . . . cum huius (Sullae) periculi propulsione *coniungam* defensionem officii mei. Quo quidem genere orationis non uterer, si . . . mea solum interesset. Cp. 3. 10, 16. 47 and p. Flacc. 16. 38.

We are at no loss to render these into English: our ambiguous form of apodosis with *would* and *should* meets the issue very well.

The suggestions offered in this paper may perhaps have brought into light, or, at least, into clearer light, some of the forces that are at work in the conditional sentence.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA. H. C. NUTTING.

[1] By defined cases is meant those whose context throws light upon the meaning of the words with which we are dealing; just as in the sentence Utatur sane: non peto, the independent subjunctive standing alone might have many shades of meaning; but *sane* and *non peto* settle beyond a doubt that concession is intended. Just so here the futures in the context throw light upon the time to which the imperfect subjunctive is opposed.

Digitized by Google

III.—*APĀṂ NAPĀT* AGAIN.

There has recently appeared in the Archiv für Religionswissenschaft, III. Band, 1. Heft, pp. 18–51, a very interesting article on the Indo-Iranian deity Apąm Napāt, by Mr. Louis H. Gray, of Columbia University. In this article, citing numerous passages in support of his view, Mr. Gray argues with considerable force that Apąm Napāt was originally a water deity.

In two brief articles dealing with the same subject, Journal of the American Oriental Society, vol. XIX, pp. 137–50, I have already expressed the opinion that the Hindu Apāṁ Napāt was originally a lightning deity, and that he became absorbed by Agni in Vedic times. While these two views are apparently contradictory, they are by no means irreconcilable—indeed, they may readily be brought together upon common ground. It is simply a question of one's point of view. To my own mind, the problem presented is this: What was the natural phenomenon, if any, upon which the Indo-Iranian deity called Apāṁ Napāt by the Hindus, was based? Mr. Gray has taken up the question from quite a different standpoint, and his problem may be stated in the form, What was the Indo-Iranian view of the nature of the Avestan deity Apąm Napāt? In other words, one paper has to do with the native view of the nature of the deity, while the other two, my own, deal with the question, What was the actual nature of the object or phenomenon worshiped as a deity under this name?

It thus becomes evident that the deity in question may have been a lightning deity in reality, though it may have been regarded by its native worshipers as a water deity. That the Hindu Apāṁ Napāt originally had none of the attributes of a fire god, I have long been satisfied: that he was looked upon in the early days as a water god, I can readily believe; and yet that he was after all, in the last analysis, originally a lightning god pure and simple—i. e. that the Indo-Iranians, while doubtless supposing themselves to be worshiping a water god, were in reality actually worshiping the lightning's bolt—I am more convinced than ever, after reading the new evidence brought forward in the article already cited.

Digitized by Google

It has been my good fortune to be able to study the thunderstorm in ten different States of the Union. As a child, living in Maine and Massachusetts, I felt a sort of unreasoning terror of the comparatively mild New England storms. This was soon taken out of me, later on, by the terrific thunder and lightning of Central Iowa; and the thunderstorm became an exceedingly interesting natural phenomenon. In the Northern Mississippi Valley, on the Western Plains, and possibly also, in spite of its forests, in Northern Michigan, with all of which I am familiar, the climatic conditions must resemble somewhat those of the extensive region in which the Indo-Iranians are supposed to have lived and wandered. In any case, it is sufficiently clear that the country to the north of the Hindu Kush and to the east of the Caspian is a region of fearful thunderstorms.[1] That the phenomena observed in storms of this kind should not excite the religious imagination of such a people as the Indo-Iranians is hardly to be thought of. That they should recognize the true nature of the phenomena is quite as difficult to believe, however, no matter to what extent their worship of these manifestations of the power of nature may have been developed. How, then, did they worship the lightning?

According to my own belief, it was in three ways. First, as a smiting fire god, the Avestan Verethraghna, the Vedic Agni Vṛtrahan, but of this more at another time; second, as a wonderful, brilliant 'water-sprite,' the Apāṁ Napāt of this paper; and, lastly, as a heavenly manifestation, to which, for lack of a better name, they gave the title 'Third,' Vedic Trita, who is probably to be recognized in the highly anthropomorphic Avestan Thraẹtaona Āthwi̯a.

If, now, a careful study be made of the epithets used, in both the Avestan and the Vedic literature, of Apāṁ Napāt, it will appear that every one of them readily adjusts itself to the homage which a primitive people might be expected to give to such a phenomenon as the distant, descending bolt, or the falling ball of fire, which is sometimes called 'chain-lightning.'[2] That they

[1] Even if the view be accepted that the original home of Apąm Napāt was regarded as the river Aras (see Mr. Gray's article, cited above, p. 29), the position taken in this paper will in no wise be invalidated.

[2] So called because, to the popular fancy, it resembles a chain hanging from heaven to earth, the waving line being suggestive of links. Many, however, use the term of 'zigzag lightning,' and it is frequently so defined, the falling

Digitized by Google

should call it the 'Child of the Waters' is also perfectly natural; for, in the first place, it practically never appears except with the rain. I have seen many such bolts; and yet I can remember but a single one, in all my experience, which fell when there was no rain, and that one I did not see myself, though I know that it struck a chimney on a building only a quarter of a mile away from where I was at the time, a fact which might better ally it with the smiting god, Agni. Again, as is well known—it is, in fact, a commonplace among the weather-wise—thunderstorms are wont to follow the water-courses, possibly because water is such an excellent conductor of electricity. This tendency to follow the water-courses simply means, of course, that the most violent part of the storm spends itself in the river valleys or over the lakes. In other words, the phenomenon known as 'chain-lightning,' i. e. the bolt that seems to connect heaven and earth, is most common where there are bodies of water. I have watched such bolts over the lake at Chicago, I have seen them over Lake Winnepesaukee, I have observed them from the Ossipees in the distant Pemigewasset Valley, I have seen them over the lake at Bay View, Michigan, and I have watched them in the Kennebec Valley in Maine; but I have seldom seen them on the Prairies, or the Plains, away from the streams, although I have spent about eighteen years in the West, including the States of Iowa, Illinois, Colorado, and South Dakota. During a nine-years residence in Iowa, most of the time some twenty miles from the nearest stream, I knew of but one building that was struck by lightning —namely, the one mentioned above which had its chimney damaged;—and yet the storms were at times terrific. As a rule, Trita was the only god in evidence. Occasionally, however, a descending bolt could be seen in the distance; and I can remember one, at the time of the tornado at Grinnell, which was clearly not in the neighborhood of some stream, i. e. it was too near to the town to be regarded as falling in the river valley which lay in

ball of fire being called 'ball-lightning.' In this paper the term is used in that popular sense which includes 'ball-lightning,' when seen at a distance, and also any other distant bolt which descends directly from the clouds to the earth. It seems to be the most convenient way of including any and all distant bolts which pass directly from the clouds to the earth in an approximately straight line, and it was to all such bolts that I believe the expression *apāṁ napāt* was applied, since a distinction could not possibly have been made between them by the Indo-Iranians.

Digitized by Google

that direction. In this connection it may be well to mention two photographs which are in my possession. One of them, taken by a friend, is the picture of a bolt which seemed to descend directly into Lake Winnepesaukee, as did two other similar ones that preceded it.[1] The other is a photograph of a bolt, taken in Baltimore, which appeared to descend directly into Chesapeake Bay.

While the supposed land of the Indo-Iranians has lost most of its streams and lakes, and, with them, a large part of its rainfall, which may once have been heavy in places, as it is in our own Mississippi Valley, assuredly the nature of lightning has not changed with the lapse of years. What, then, could be more natural than that the distant, descending bolts should come to be associated with the rivers and the lakes into which they seemed to go? or that they should come to be worshiped as the 'Child of the Waters'?

If, now, the worshipers of this deity, as they wandered in the course of time into a land where the lightning was less in evidence, should begin to forget his old appearance while still keeping up the forms of his worship, and should come to associate the god yet more closely with the waters, would it be strange if his attri-

[1] Curiously enough, these three bolts were the only examples of this kind of lightning during the whole course of the storm. They all appeared in the same place. Since this paper was written I have had an opportunity to observe a still more curious phenomenon. While returning from the Thursday evening meeting on May 10, I noticed frequent 'heat-lightning' in the South-west. From the upper part of my house it became evident that a violent storm was raging in the Missouri Valley, some fifty miles away. The light-ning was so incessant that the longest intervals between the flashes did not exceed thirty seconds. It was of endless variety—now lighting up clouds that had been invisible in the moonlight, now leaping from one dark cloud-bank to another, with the peculiar pink tint which characterizes this form of the lightning, and now appearing as a tall, wavy pillar with its base on the earth and its head in the sky. At least thirty bolts of this last variety (I did not begin to count them at once) fell in a short time, and a photographer could have caught fully five sixths of them without moving his camera. The remaining sixth seemed to be located some twenty degrees to the northwest of the others; but they, too, were confined to a single small spot. A few storms like this, among the Indo-Iranians, would have located Apāṁ Napāt as a dweller in that region; for this is the form of the lightning which I believe was worshiped by them under some such name. On the other hand, the pink-tinted bolt of the upper air is the form to which I believe they gave a name corresponding to Trita.

Digitized by Google

butes should come to be referred to a water god pure and simple? Such a drifting might easily have taken place in one branch of the family, while a closer association with other lightning deities might come to be effected in another.

To my mind, the whole question centres in this simple problem, What starting-point, what phenomenon, what theory gives the simplest and most direct connection with all the facts, doing violence to none, and accommodating itself to each? After many weeks of careful study and deep thought, no other solution appears to me to be so simple and so satisfactory as the supposition that the lightning—misunderstood, to be sure, but still the lightning—was the real basis for all the myths concerning Apām Napāt, in whatever form he may be supposed to have become fixed as a deity, in any branch of the Indo-European family.

With regard to Ποσειδῶν and Neptune, cited by Mr. Gray, it should be said that the highly anthropomorphic deities of Greece and Rome, though a distinction must be made between the gods of the early Republic and those of the Empire, can be used, at best, only with the greatest caution, for comparative purposes, in matters of this kind. In addition to the natural drifting, which is always inevitable, it must be remembered that the whole viewpoint of the people had changed. Many things had been forgotten completely by the Greeks and by the Romans, the worship of various gods had been amalgamated, new deities had been adopted; and, in each case, what might be called a new pantheon had been evolved from the old and new elements. Traces, roots, fossils there were, in abundance, which went back to the early days; but they were still only traces or roots or fossils, nothing more; and they can not be used with anything like the same confidence, with regard to early conditions, that can be had in the more conservative and more sacredly cherished Veda and Avesta. In short, Greek and Roman mythology should be used, in my opinion, merely as a means for suggesting possible early conditions, rather than as a means for determining what those conditions really were. The Prometheus myth, in some form, appears in various languages; but it is a far different thing in Sanskrit from what it is in Greek, and the two can not be compared at all in detail. The Greek myth has become entirely anthropomorphic, and it would appear that popular etymology, too, has had its full share in warping the original story. Even Ζεύς, in spite of the many traces of the ancient god, is by no

Digitized by Google

means the Hindu Dyāus; nor yet is Jupiter, though Horace sings

> quod latus mundi nebulae malusque
> Juppiter urget.—I xxii. 19–20.

By all means let us define our terms, that we may the better understand one another. My own search has been for the actual basis upon which the Hindu and the Iranian rested his faith. It has not been for his opinion of that basis, or for his idea of its nature. These two things, by the way—the actual and the supposed nature of the deity—may in fact be as far apart as the Poles. That would be no inconsistency from the standpoint of the Indo-Iranian worshipers, and this fact must be given its due weight in the final equation.

Assuredly, the Vedic epithets applied to Apāṁ Napāt fit admirably the lightning's bolt in the form known as 'chain-lightning.' They are somewhat as follows: [1]'horse-driving-one' (see below); [2]'who shines within the waters (the rain), with-no-need-of-kindlings'; [3]'driving-horses with skill and vigor' (see below); [4]'rushing agile-one'; [5]'whom stallions swift-as-thought convey' (cf. the English slang phrase 'quicker than chain-lightning'); [6]'water-born' (rain-born); [7]'beaming waters stand round about the beaming shining Apāṁ Napāt'; [8]'purifying waters stream about him'; [9]'with mighty flames, he richly shines, with-no-need-of-kindlings, clothed-in-ghee (clarified-butter), in the waters' (with 'clothed-in-ghee' cf. the yellow color of 'chain-lightning'); [10]'the unwavering (unmovable?) god' (cf. the direct fixed course of 'chain-lightning' with the crooked paths of other bolts); [11]'to the deep-valleys, so-to-speak, he flows forth in the waters (rain)' (cf. the apparent descent of 'chain-lightning' into the valleys in a mountainous country, i. e. into the river valleys, as noted above); [12]'his birth (is) in heaven'; [13]'neither hardships nor wrongs can reach the not-to-be-disregarded-one in (his) crude cloud-castles yonder'; [14]'Apāṁ Napāt shines far-and-wide, exuberant within the waters (rain) for the giving-of-good to the worshiping-one' (cf. India's dependence upon the rain); [15]'(he) shines far-and-wide, holy, untiring, with divine flame in the waters (rain)'; [16]'erect, clothed with light (lightning), Apāṁ Napāt verily betakes-himself to the bosom of the oblique-ones (the falling rain)'; [17]'carrying his pre-eminent majesty, the golden-colored streams rush about (stream about him)' (cf. the bright gleam that always surrounds 'chain-lightning'); [18]'of-a-golden-

Digitized by Google

color, gold-like (is) that Apāṁ Napāt, and he (is) even golden; from a golden home (birthplace) letting-himself-down, bestowing-gold, he gives food to this-one (the singer)'; [19] 'his face increases, and (so does) the dear sacred form (name) of Apāṁ Napāt' (cf. the bolt as it increases in length while descending); [20] 'Apāṁ Napāt, whose-color-can-not-be-blotted-out, with the body of another, so-to-speak, (fire?) is active here (on earth)'; [21] 'bringing to their son ghee as food, the swiftly-streaming Waters of-their-own-accord (him) with veils conceal (fly about), (while) standing on this highest station, ever shining with undimmed (rays).'

The Vedic passages, given in the same order, as shown by the superior figures, are as follows: [1] *āçuhémā*, vii. 47, 2; [2] *yó anidhmó dídayad apsv àntár*, x. 30, 4; [3] *āçuhémā dhiyá çámi*, ii. 31, 6; [4] *rāspinásyāyóḥ*, i. 122, 4; [5] *manojúvo vṛṣaṇo yáṁ váhanti*, i. 186, 5; [6] *nādyó*, ii. 35, 1; and, from the same hymn,

[7] *tám ú çúciṁ çúcayo dídivāṁsam apāṁ nápātam pári tasthur ápaḥ.* 3.

[8] *tám* ..... *marmṛjyámānāḥ pári yanty ápaḥ,*

[9] *sá çukrébhiḥ çikvabhí revád asmé dídāyānidhmó ghṛtánirṇig apsú.* 4.

[10] ..... *avyathyāya* ..... *devāya* ....

[11] *kṛtá ivópa hí prasarsré apsú* .... 5.

[12] ..... *jánimāsyá ca svàr* .....

[13] *āmāsu pūrṣú paró apramṛṣyáṁ nárālayo ví naçan nánṛtāni.* 6.

[14] *só apāṁ nápād ūrjáyann apsv àntár vasudéyāya vidhaté ví bhāti.* 7.

[15] *yó apsv á çúcinā dāívyena ṛtávājasra urviyá vibhāti,* 8.

[16] *apāṁ nápād á hy ásthād upásthaṁ jihmánām ūrdhvó vidyútaṁ vásānaḥ,*

[17] *tásya jyéṣṭham mahimánaṁ váhantīr hiraṇyavarṇāḥ pári yanti yahvíḥ.* 9.

[18] *hiraṇyarūpaḥ sá hiraṇyasaṁdṛg apāṁ nápāt séd u hiraṇya-varṇaḥ,*
hiraṇyáyāt pári yóner niṣádhyā hiraṇyadá dadaty ánnam asmāi. 10.

[19] *tád asyānīkam utá cáru námāpīcyàṁ vardhate náptur apām,* 11.

[20] *só apāṁ nápād ánabhimlātavarṇo 'nyásyevehá tanvà viveṣa.* 13.

[21] *asmin padé paramé tasthivāṁsam adhvasmábhir viçváhā dídi-vāṁsam,*
ápo náptre ghṛtám annaṁ váhantīḥ svayám átkāiḥ pári dīyanti yahvíḥ. 14.

Digitized by Google

These are the passages upon which the study of Apāṁ Napāt in the Rig-Veda (JAOS., vol. XIX, pp. 137–44) was based; but, striking as these passages are, it was not from the Veda at all that I first got the impression that Apāṁ Napāt was the phenomenon known as 'chain-lightning': it was from the Avesta. As a matter of fact, the study of Apāṁ Napāt just cited was made for the sole purpose of discovering whether the Vedic god would give any support to the conception which I had already formed of the Avestan one; for it was while making a study of the Avestan deity for comparative purposes, that the idea first came to me that the epithets used of this god could be explained by supposing that they were applied to 'chain-lightning.'

In the first place, Darmesteter, in his translation of the Avesta, renders epithets which are repeatedly used of the divinity, by the expressions 'the tall lord,' 'the swift-horsed, the tall and shining lord,' etc. (Sacred Books of the East, vol. XXIII, pp. 5, 6, 14, 36, 38, etc.); while Mills, in his completion of the work, uses the renderings 'lofty,' 'brilliant,' 'glittering-one,' etc. (SBE., vol. XXXI, pp. 197, 204, 219, 319, 326, etc.). These expressions certainly fit 'chain-lightning' quite as well as those cited from the Veda do; and, when the bold figures which characterize an Oriental tongue are remembered, the expression 'swift-horsed' is singularly happy for depicting the rapid descent of the lightning's bolt.

Again, there is a passage in Yasht xix. 51 which Mr. Gray (p. 26) renders as follows: "this Glory got the start unto the sea Vourukasha. Straightway the Child of the Waters, whose steeds are swift, seized it, and this was the wish of the Child of the Waters, whose steeds are swift: I shall seize this Glory, the Unattainable, at the bottom of the deep sea, at the bottom of the profound lakes." Now, to my mind, this is simply a highly colored and decidedly poetic description of a natural phenomenon which I have observed again and again in connection with 'chain-lightning.' At times there comes a flash with a sort of preliminary bolt, which is scarcely noticed. This is instantly followed by a brilliant, gleaming bolt which seems to rush, like a stream of liquid fire, straight to the earth or into some body of water. It comes just where the first flash appeared, and lingers much longer than ordinary bolts do. Moreover, it seems suggestive, even to a dull Western imagination, of something pouncing upon something else, so peculiar is the effect of the brilliant flash following closely

Digitized by Google

upon the heels of the first, milder one. It is as though a great stream of giant sparks leaped from one electrode to another in swift succession. While this phenomenon is comparatively rare in the East, it can often be seen in certain parts of the West.[1]

Now, it is generally agreed that the 'Glory' of the passage quoted is light of some sort. It 'gets the start into the sea,' i. e. there comes a preliminary flash, probably over the Caspian; then 'the Child of the Waters seizes it,' i. e. the second brilliant flash or bolt pounces after the first; and, lastly, he 'wishes to seize it at the bottom of the sea,' or, in other words, the bolt seems to fall into the Caspian.[2] This, to be sure, is very figurative language, and yet it is not more so than the forms of speech which our own American Indians are constantly using on formal occasions. Indeed, their speeches sometimes excite the derision of the newspapers because of this very feature.[3] But, if painted savages are capable of such forms of speech, why should the figures used by the old Aryan 'shepherds,' in the Vedas and the Avesta, seem strange? It is hardly necessary, perhaps, to call attention to the fact that the Avesta represents the incident just referred to as taking place during the battle of Ātar, 'Fire,' and Azhi Dahāka (the Avestan sky-dragon), i. e. in the midst of a thunderstorm.

The section next following (loc. cit., 52), Mr. Gray renders: "We praise the lofty, lordly Child of the Waters, (genius) of women, brilliant, whose steeds are swift, virile, hearing prayer,

[1] There were three such bolts during the short time that I was watching the storm mentioned above in a footnote. It is what is technically called 'ball-lightning' or 'globe-lightning,' and when seen near at hand appears like a falling ball of fire. .

[2] After this paper was in type, the position which it advocates was strikingly confirmed by an item in The Bath (Maine) Independent of July 21, 1900, which published on its third page, under the heading 'Saw It Strike,' the following statement: "During a thunder shower that passed over Boothbay harbor Tuesday evening John G. Reed and his wife of Woolwich were at their cottage on the Southport shore, their sloop yacht being moored on the stream near by. They had the front door open and Capt. Reed was outside. He had just remarked that the storm was over when a flash of vivid light and a tremendous thunder clap occurred together and the lightning bolt struck the salt water between the boat and the house. There was a hissing sound and then John observed 'That was a pretty big rocket!'"

[3] A fairly good example of what is meant may be found in the translation of a speech quoted from The Christian Advocate of March, 1833, by Mr. O. W. Nixon, in his book entitled 'How Marcus Whitman Saved Oregon,' pp. 52–3.

Digitized by Google

who created men, who shaped men, the angel beneath the Waters, who hath the most attentive ear when he is praised." But the word *upāpō*, which is rendered "beneath the Waters," means rather 'in,' 'within,' or 'near the waters,' in spite of Greek ὑπό; for the prevailing sense of *upa* is not 'beneath.' It commonly means 'at,' 'on,' 'in,' 'near,' 'by,' etc. 'Chain-lightning' might naturally be called 'the angel (praiseworthy-one) within-the-waters' by such a people; and the use of the word *ap*, 'water,' for rain, in both Sanskrit and Zend, is simply a parallel to the Greek ὕδωρ, and ὕδωρ πολύ.

The rest of the passage contains nothing that militates against the assumption that 'chain-lightning' is meant. The statement that he hears prayer so freely, doubtless has reference to the surprising effects that follow a rain- or thunderstorm in any country devoid of forests. The other epithets, i. e. those which have not already been touched upon, are all of so similar a nature that they can be disregarded, with the exception of a single one—namely, the word *khṣathrīm*. This word is said to be found only in the Avesta, and to be used of Apąm Napāt alone. Its meaning, fixed by translations like the Sanskrit *svāmī nārīṇām* (or *strīṇām*), is 'lord of women.' This is regarded by some scholars as an evidence that the deity in question was "the symbol of the fructifying principle contained in the waters." See Mr. Gray's article, p. 38. But the symbolism of these people was concrete, not abstract, in its very essence; and it was often startlingly realistic, so realistic, in fact, that it can not be reproduced in modern speech, except by paraphrases or euphemisms. Witness on the Hindu side, for example, the 'parents' of Agni, and the native idea of fire-getting, or the ritual attending the 'consecration' of the 'twice-born,' or the rites still used in celebrating the Durgāpūjā, 'worship of Durga,' not to mention those of the Pūrṇābhiṣeka, 'complete consecration.' If Apąm Napāt is to be regarded as a water deity on the basis of this epithet, it can only be in the sense that he produced (gave forth) the waters (rain); for no other possible meaning can be in keeping with Indo-Iranian methods of thought.[1] The idea that the deity was "the

[1] Cf. Yasht viii. 4, cited by Mr. Gray, p. 25, "from the Child of the Waters doth come the seed" (*cithrem*). The Sanskrit contains various similar passages, though there is often a double sense to be observed, as where rain and Soma, or rain as Soma, must be kept in mind. For example: 'let Apāṁ Napāt, the horse-driver, set-in-motion (favor), O Waters, your wave most sweet,' *tám*

Digitized by Google

symbol of the fructifying principle contained in the waters" may be a beautiful thought; but it is essentially modern, and bears none of the earmarks of Indo-Iranian ways of looking at such matters. It is of course possible to take this statement in a concrete sense; but that at once raises the question, What was the natural phenomenon, since that was what they worshiped, which was regarded as a symbol of this fructifying power? It must have been something. What was it? What else is there to which it can be so simply and naturally referred as the lightning? As the god who sent forth the waters (the rain) to bring life to every green thing on the earth, he would, naturally enough, be the 'lord of women,' as they viewed these things. But, if he is a water god on this basis, the same old question still confronts us: What was the thing or phenomenon which was regarded as sending forth the rain? There is but one natural answer: The lightning; for the outburst of rain follows it, along with the thunder. As a matter of fact, the downpour is especially noticeable after the bolts commonly called 'chain-lightning,' and it does not require a very active imagination to see how suggestive to the minds of these people the sudden appearance of a pillar of waving fire, followed by the pouring rain, might be.

In no case can an abstract symbolism be admitted for the Indo-Iranians, where a concrete one is possible. They did not think in that way, were not capable of it, in fact, except to a very limited extent, any more than other ancient races; and it will not do to read modern Western ideas into ancient Eastern expressions, no matter how alluring the temptation may be. Moreover,

---

ūrmím āpo mádhumattamaṁ vo 'páṁ nápād avatv āçuhémā, R.V. vii. 47, 2; 'let him give to you to-day the beautifully clarified wave,' *sá vo dadad ūrmím adyá sápūtaṁ*, x. 30, 3; 'O Apāṁ Napāt, give sweet waters,' *dpāṁ napān mádhumatīr apó dā*, x. 30, 4; and, of the same general import, 'Apāṁ Napāt, the good, by the glory (greatness) of his godhead (asuraship) begot all creatures,' *apáṁ nápād asuryásya mahnā víçvāny aryó bhúvanā jajāna*, ii. 35, 2. The 'glory of his godhead' may possibly refer to the impression of greatness produced upon the mind of the worshiper by the lightning's glare. The Sanskrit commentary on Yaçna i. 5, cited by Mr. Gray, p. 23, must be taken in the same general way, i. e. concretely. He renders it: "the lord Burja is the angel of women: his nature is water, that is, he is the unadulterated source; from him is the very navel of the waters, even as whence—from him—is the seed of the water named Arvand, by which are produced the most beautiful horses." The passage commented on is rendered "I invoke, I propitiate the lofty, lordly Child of the Waters"; while the Sanskrit parallel is given as "I invoke, I propitiate the lord Burja, navel of the Waters."

Digitized by Google

the difference between modern ideas of taste and those of the ancient world must still be reckoned with, even if ancient ideas, in some cases, seem strange to us, not to say positively repulsive; and it must not be forgotten that forms of speech which are impossible in modern society were a commonplace not only in the life and literature of the ancient Hindus and other contemporary races, but also among our own ancestors not many centuries ago.

If, then, Apāṁ Napāt is regarded as the god who gave forth the rain, and is, for that reason, considered a water god, well and good. He may also be looked upon as a water god because of the close association of 'chain-lightning' with the rain and with large bodies of water; but his essential characteristics as a form of the lightning remain untouched, or rather, are rendered even more certain by this very fact.

In conclusion, it may be safe to infer, first, that the Indo-Iranian god called the 'Child of the Waters' was nothing more nor less than 'chain-lightning'; for he has retained distinct evidences of such an original nature in both the Rik and the Avesta. It may also be safe to assume, in the second place, that his nature was still unchanged when the Gāthās and the hymns were composed, but that it had faded somewhat, in each case, by the time they were compiled. It seems clear, in the third place, that this fading continued in each instance until the Vedic god came to be associated with, or practically absorbed by, Agni in the Sanskrit ritual, while the old association of Apąm Napāt and Ātar in the Avesta was quite lost sight of in the Avestan ritual. Cf. Mr. Gray's article, pp. 32–3. That the two were associated in the Avesta, however, is clear, since it does not rest merely on the fact that they are so often mentioned close together; for the passage cited above, in which Ātar fights with the sky-dragon for the 'Glory,' while the 'Child of the Waters' seizes it, evidently as his helper, can not be disposed of by the ritual. But, when this drifting was once started, it is difficult to say where it might end; and it may well be that characteristics of this god appear in Greek and Roman mythology, although this puts the god still further back into Aryan times, and allows for even greater changes than any that have yet been considered.

For my own part, I am quite willing to believe that the god was Aryan. Agni, in some form, must have been Aryan, as is shown by Latin *ignis*. Ātar must have been Indo-Iranian, as is

Digitized by Google

shown by Sanskrit athar-van and Athar-va-Veda, and he too may have been Aryan, possibly the original 'spook-killer.' This would allow Agni to be somewhat neutral in the beginning, and might account for Latin *ignis*. If Agni then gradually assumed the functions of the 'spook-killer,' and took an addition to his name in this character, a thing common enough later on, Agni Vṛtrahan and Verethraghna could be accounted for, and the dropping of *Athar would also be explained, even if Ātar did survive. It would then only be necessary for Agni to develop in his character as 'Fire,' while losing his accidental pre-eminence as the 'slayer of Vṛtra,' to allow Indra Vṛtrahan, the comparatively late Hindu god, to find a place in the pantheon. All this is mere conjecture, of course; but the field is an open one, and the nature of the problem is such that many a guess must be ventured before any satisfactory basis of belief can be reached.

REDFIELD COLLEGE, REDFIELD, S. D. H. W. MAGOUN.

Digitized by Google

IV.—ITEMS FROM THE GĀTHIC PAHLAVI.

As Sāyaṇa is at times extremely difficult, and at others as amusing as he is erroneous, so all other translations of our older books share these peculiarities.

And as time has shown us that the 'horned' Moses was not a necessity, and that a certain Greek word means a 'stag,' and not an 'elephant,' so we have at last through years gradually become aware of the errors of the old Pahlavi commentaries on the Gāthas. But we have a little overdone that business, and for a very natural reason; for while all the other commentaries nearly (with the exception of some of those on the cuneiform and other such inscriptions) are easy at least to read, the Pahlavi translations, if worked up as they ought to be, plunge us at once into toil which requires actual decipherment at every step, and which is naturally often far more harassing than the treatment of the 'good' Pahlavi of the books, for while simpler sentences are clear at a glance in both kinds of Pahlavi, in the classical forms the original translators were helped by the context in the more difficult parts.

But in the Gātha commentaries, context often gives us no aid at all. Accuracy may be wholly wanting in one place, where the most valuable results await us at the next word. As a consequence many of us (unconsciously) clubbed together to keep up our appearances while we ignored or (unintentionally[1]) misrepresented the whole subject. And one of the least critical remarks that we have ever made was that the translations of the Gāthas depend upon a crude application of 'etymology,' without any report of the actual special sense. We have indeed at times traces of attempts in 'etymology' as entertaining as anything in the great Indian translator. Take, for instance, the word *khrafstrā* in Y. 28, 5, acknowledged on all hands to be difficult as to its etymology (though I believe all accept its somewhat ill-bred application, describing the sinners either as 'verminous,' or as actual 'wild

[1] I confess that I for one began my studies on the commentaries almost with the predominant wish to discredit them.

Digitized by Google

beasts'). I for one among others made my proposal that the word was Zend for *kalpa+āçitīṛn* 'flesh-gnawers'; but I did so with hesitation. Some venerable scholiast in almost forgotten centuries saw the word accidentally divided in some MSS, or, indeed, he thought he might divide its elements, referring *khra* to the root of *khratu* = 'understanding' and *stra* to *star* = 'to scatter,' and so gave us what is, though practically an excellent derived meaning, yet a very defective piece of etymology, for it gives no account of the *f*.

I do not know that others have made themselves very merry over this particular case, for few have been aware of it; but it certainly seems to me to be a lame enough attempt. We must not, however, forget our own shortcomings; nor are we at all so sure that the original translator did not anticipate our own procedure and 'emend' his text itself to leave out the *f*, or, like a certain modern translator, he *conceived of it* as emended. And what shall we think of a superlative termination—say, for example, such as *-est* in *kind-est*—being divided from its base and translated separately and erroneously? Yet this is what happens with *sev-išlāi* in Y. 28, 5. *-išlāi*, wonderful to say, is rendered as if it were a form from *iš* = 'to wish,' and for this there is no defence whatsoever, for it was not intended at all as an ultimate etymological explanation of this superlative termination as indicating the 'wished,' and so the 'best' or 'most.' But there is a very powerful series of facts which act well as an *excuse* for it, though in no sense as a justification. For we have clear evidence from these that this treatment was wholly *isolated*, and was due to some exceptional circumstance operating adversely upon the mind of the early expositor. We are scandalised at this translation of a termination in one case, and we are not to be blamed. But why was not the same thing done with the same termination *-išt-*, in the very next line (see *mazišlem*)? And so we may ask with regard to *vahišlā* at Y. 28, 8; *vahišlem*, Y. 28, 9; *aojišlō* at Y. 29, 3; *mairišlō* at Y. 29, 4; *acišlā*, Y. 30, 5; *spēnišlō*, next line; *khraozhdišlēñg*, next word; *āsišlā*, Y. 30, 10; *mazišlām*, Y. 31, 13; *vāzišlō*, Y. 31, 22; *vaẓdišlō*, Y. 32, 7; *razišlā*, Y. 33, 1; *nazdišlām*, Y. 33, 4; *mazišlem*, Y. 33, 5. Notice especially the case of the same identical word *sēvišlō* recurring at Y. 33, 11; then see *spenišlā* at Y. 33, 12; *āsišlem* (sic) at Y. 34, 4; *spēnišlā*, Y. 43, 2; *vaẓdišlō*, Y. 46, 19; *fraçšlaoñhō*, Y. 49, 8; *nazdišlam*, Y. 50, 3; *zevišlyēñg*, Y. 50, 7 (?); *aibī-bairišlem*, Y. 51, 1. No

Digitized by Google

such curiosity as this translation of this termination occurs at these texts.

I do not notice a single further recurrence of this mistake in the Gāthas, though there is one in the commentary on the Hōm yasht (see my edition of Y. ix. 1–48, deciphered and edited, with collation and variants of all the MSS, in the Journal of the R. Asiatic Society, of July). This odd treatment of *-išṭāi* at Y. 28, 5, therefore obviously arose from some exceptional cause. Some early scribe, holding every syllable to be sacred, saw this one detached, and so explained (!) it.

Another very curious work of supererogation was to translate every terminal suffix containing *d* as if it were a form of *dā* = 'to give,' even in such a word as *kadā* = 'when,' though this is an extreme case. This extra word occurs sometimes when the old scholar had given us a 'priceless' indication in his translation of the main body of the word.[1] I can only account for the phenomenon by saying again as before that every syllable of the text seemed so sacred that every shred of it was reproduced. But once we are aware of this crotchet, it really does us little harm, frequent as its recurrence may be; for, as I have said often enough, it would be puerile to expect a smooth rhetoric in such a place.

Aside from such instances as I have hinted at, where else is the false etymology in this entire section? Here are some 223-odd words: where are there more than a few units falsely etymologised as to their radical sense?

And are we to find fault with the *correct* etymology! Beginners in Gāthic criticism have (some few of them) not yet learned how even to find fault. Having once heard the remark that the Pahlavi translator 'etymologises,' they have utterly blundered in applying it.

As I have pointed out before in this Journal,[2] the actual consecutive terms of the Gāthic texts are in themselves for the most part very plain, the hapaxlegomena excepted, the crux of the whole matter lying more in the shades of the derived meaning,

[1] See as to *gūḷōdūm* = *gūḷōdvem*, the *-dvem* is ridiculously translated as a form of *dā*, but *gūšh*, in the face of all 'etymology,' is rendered correctly 'hear.' A feeble 'etymology' would have given us 'shriek ye' or 'roar'; cf. the Indian *ghush*, but the Iranian word means just the contrary, as the ancient translator first taught us, basing his conclusions solely on realism.

[2] See 'The Gāthas as Consecutive Words.'

Digitized by Google

and in the syntax. How could a translator into Pahlavi or into any other language help 'etymologising' when reproducing such terms as we have for the most part in Y. 28. Not that the grammatical forms are at all so closely represented for us; but a little critical discrimination shows that the defects even as to this particular have been grossly exaggerated.

I remember a by no means inconsiderable student who was scandalised at 'verbs being rendered by nouns' (!), plus a pointing pronoun; but such a rendering should be regarded as most effective—'mine *is* the gladdening' is as good as 'I gladden.' Recollect that we should especially claim for the renderings that they are a mass of overworked material, which, of course, rather heightens than lowers their value to the close expert, for the more numerous are the strata of consecutive treatments, the keener becomes our hope of the gems of antiquity.

Neryōsang, it may be said here, is never slavishly to be followed. His translations were, as he avows, made from the Pahlavi texts of the translators; but he often misunderstands them, or wilfully departs from our present texts of them. And if the Pahlavi translators report old meanings familiar to themselves through hereditary teaching, but derived from Zend-gāthic texts long vanished and differing from those which they had just written on the paper before their eyes, how much more probable is it that the Sanskrit translator expressed opinions which varied from those of our present Pahlavi translations, and from a similar cause —reporting ideas which he had inherited independently of our present Pahlavi texts (for he never repeats any Pahlavi texts: he gives us only the Zend and his Sanskrit)? But whatever be their faults or their value, as the commentaries Pahlavi, Persian and Sanskrit were the sole original source of all our knowledge, critical or otherwise, in the past, we must weigh them laboriously for our estimates in the present and the future, for they have by no means finished their work in any sense whatsoever. Every teacher should be examined in them, of course, as an indispensable preliminary to his functions; but this is by no means all.

We should especially, therefore, study the places where they have established crucial points. For instance, I can not trace much etymology in *anizār-vindishnīh* for the difficult *aghzhāoñ-vamnem* of Y. 28, 3; yet, 'having an unweakened acquisition' is not so bad for 'imperishable' or 'not transitory,' though this case is not very significant.

Digitized by Google

Then, where is the error in *āmūkht-am* for *khsāi* (at Y. 28, 4) 'I have learned' or 'I have taught'[1]? This translation of *khsā* [cp. Ind. (?) **khçā* (?)] rescues a word abandoned by our great expounder of Pāṇini as 'an invention of Kātyāyana's.' How could it be an 'invention of Kātyāyana,' when it stood in the Gātha hundreds of years before Pāṇini existed, even putting him at 400 B. C. and K. at B. C. 300? and where is the 'etymology' between *khsā* and *āmūkhtano*, though the Pahlavi translator had been repeating its forms for centuries as the only word for this *khsā*, and yet we are supercilious over his 'etymology'? Then with 'etymology' alone as a guide, Neryōsang would never have rendered *yānāiš* (Y. 28, 9), which means 'on account of boons,' by *çubhena* 'on account of a benefit.' *Yāna* means even a 'wagon' sometimes in Indian; at best it means 'giving a helping on,' and so a 'way,' a 'path.' Without Ner. the Pahlavi *yān* too would be thought a mere 'transliteration' (of course it is Zend at the second stage, with the same Iranian meaning 'boon, favour' as we know from Ner.). Then, who can not see how fine a distinction we have suggested to us by the Pahlavi translator at Y. 28, 11, where he insists that *nipāoñhę* is a 1st singular middle = 'I protect'? This strengthens Whitney's hesitating view as to *arcase*, *ṛñjase*, etc. (see his Grammar, on the *s*-aor.). It is as fine a point of the kind as was ever made; not that it is fully followed as yet, for *nipāoñhę* looks also quite like an infinitive. So far from 'etymologising' over our unfortunate *taviščā* at Y. 29, 1, the translator (?) not only refuses to translate, but gives us our only serious text. See the connection 'On me come wrath and the blow . . . contemptuous treatment, and *the thief*,' not the fatuous words '*and power*.' The word is not our *taviščā* of the *textus receptus*, but *tāyušcā*; the old Pahlavi-Avesta sign for *y* was only a little shorter than that for *u*, and the one pushed the other out in the course of time. Moreover, an *a* which may be 'long' in the Indian *tāyu* may very well, indeed, be short in Iranian, at least as it is reported. See, for instance, even the long *a* in *katāra*, Iranian, and short *a* in *katará* in Indian. Non-experts should be informed at this point that our present very striking Avesta alphabet was worked up from an old Avesta-Pahlavi one. The ancient Gātha stands in a character which is newer than that of its own commentary. In fact, it may well be that the sanctity of the Gātha caused that inspiration which

[1] See Y. 28, 11 *āmūxāi* = 'mayst thou teach' = Zend *šišhā*, Ner. *çikshāpaya*.

Digitized by Google

effected this remarkable achievement, one of the most striking feats in all ancient scholarship. The development of the wonderfully complete Zend alphabet was doubtless slow and gradual, and at one time it became approximately fixed, but to this day it has never been completely ranged into order. Here it has got into mishap. *Tavišcā* = 'power' in a platitude beside *tāyušcā* = 'and a thief,'[1] *taraftārich, aigham barā dūzdēḍō*; and we should so restore, thanking our translator (!) this time for not translating, nor heeding the word *tavīšcā*, which he had just been obliged to write on the paper before him. Then his rendering of *ušta* as *ušta ahurem* 'salvation lord,' in Y. 29, 2, certainly casts light on the other *ušta-composita*. I do not follow the 'translator,' indeed, just here, but the enlightened public should fully understand that we highly value suggestions which bear on passages not immediately before us. Half the praise that our greatest *Guru* got is for suggestions that are not accepted for the immediate point, *but they bear with power upon the general effort*. *Frīnēmnā* in Y. 29, 5 = 'praying' is helped out by Neryōsang's *prabravīmi*, for the Pahlavi *pranāmam* = 'I bend in praise or prayer' was once misread *fravāmam* (same signs); see the Parsi-Pers. But Ner.'s *prabravīmi* has its derived 'I praise' as well as its 'I speak forth.' The Pahlavi translator 'muddles' over *vafuš* at Y. 29, 6, but I can not see that he especially 'etymologises': it was natural enough to refer it to a *vaŋ* in an 'evil' sense. And how about the other twenty-odd words in the same strophe, all correctly sketched as to their general sense? At Y. 29, 7 the Pahlavi reporter falls into trouble with an unaccountable *vakhshīnēḍ*. 'Etymology' was, however, not his betrayer here, but a shattered text: *vakhshīnēḍ* comes from *-vōi*+the *khsh-* of the next word! *Gavōi*, like hundreds of other words, was split into parts such as *ga*+*vōi* (in some ancient text; see the irrational variants everywhere). He renders the *gavōi* really twice, as often. *Gāv-* is *gōspend*, and *vōi* was joined to the *khsh* of the wrecked *khsh-* (*vīdemcā*). But at the very next words, *hvō-urushaēibyō*, the old scribe gives us again one of the fairest restorations in literature, first applied, so brilliantly, by Darmesteter (a point which delighted Roth, who showed me the passage in Darmesteter's essay). What sort of a text had we been 'etymologising' with

[1] The cow as 'stolen away' was the typical woe of the border-state. We have elsewhere a weird and poetic picture of her, 'moaning on her dusty road.' See also SBE. XXXI, at the place.

Digitized by Google

for so long a time? *hvō-urushaẹibyō* was once *hvarushaẹibyō* = *avō khūrḍārān* 'food for the eaters,' as the Pahlavi translator had been insisting for centuries.

[Even the process of change is clear enough. The *ō* of *hvō* is epenthetic (sic), i. e. *a*+*u* = *ō*, as always; the *u* is anticipated from the *u* of *u*(*ru*), and *u*(*ru*) is the common rolling of the *r* for *ru*; *hvō*+*urush-* is *hva*(+*u*)+(*u*)*rush-*—that is to say, it is *hva-rushaẹibyō*, mechanically divided as words are at every step in the MSS. (As to the epenthesis, see also *moshu* for *ma*(+*u*)+*shu* (cp. Ind. *makhshú*) and *moghu* = *ma*(+*u*)+*ghu*. I have collected other examples, which await printing.)]

Then who gave us *aẹvō* = 'solus' at Y. 29, 8, having saved us from the same at Y. 29, 6? (See the emphatic need for *aẹvā* = 'thus' here, in this latter place. The writer (Z.) was describing the 'way' in which the chief had (not) been appointed. 'Not thus is he found' is far better than 'not a single one,' which would be a blunder here, and the translator tries to check us.) *Ashāyeḍō-mīnishnīh* (the compositum = 'of joyless mind') shows a translation of the termination in *khshān-mainẹ*, an erroneous and superfluous attempt (see above on the translation of *d* in *kadā*, etc.); but *ashayeḍ* is a good general rendering, and *ashayedō-mīnishnīh* does no harm, though its *a* privative came from the old shape of *kh*, which once stood in the quasi-Pahlavi character, and this old, original character for *kh* represented at the same time the latter *a*; hence our *ashāyēḍō*. But how about the mass of words before and after, all correctly indicated as to their main general sense, though the grammar staggers (from accidental reasons)? We learned our own grammar first from that of the translators, shattered as it was. So far as they are translators, they taught us all our beginnings, and ingratitude is not attractive.

Let me close with two striking results. One was *añtarē mrūvẹ* as 'interdico.' Strange indeed that some good writers should have blundered with their etymology when the Pahlavi translator is so rough, and even vehement, pointing straight at the truth. He seems even to be scolding posterity: *min dōstīh ī levatman valmanshān javīḍāk yehevūnam* 'from friendship with them I am separate'; *vibhinno bhavāmi* (so Ner.) 'I interdict, I say them off.' This does not look much like 'I say among'; yet people have read this strong passage falsely, till quite lately, from 'etymology' (weak-kneed enough, I candidly admit; but it was not the etymology of the Sanskrit or the Pahlavi translator, but

Digitized by Google

in the teeth of it). Then even the rare 2d pl. middle *-dvę* would have been seen in *dîdraghzhōduyę* [so our Oxford C. 1 (D. J. or J. 2)] at Y. 48, 7, years before it was seen, if we had learned our Gāthic Pahlavi. *Mūnlānō . . . dahishnō dārishnō* 'ye whose is the holding' is as good as 'ye who . . . hold,' and it is urgently repeated in the gloss *aigh tānō*. Here neither Neryōsang nor the Parsi-Persian see the slightest trace of a 2d plural. The Pahlavi solution is from some ancient scholar who lived *after* and not before Ner. and the other commentators. Mark well, I make nothing of the sagacity or stupidity of any one of the Pahlavi commentaries: I am going straight to the results; and sometimes the least sagacious preserve the predecessor's hint. And so throughout: the Pahlavi transcribers go on repeating still more ancient translators and writing upon lost texts which have perished from quasi-immemorial times, etymologising throughout, but in the overwhelming preponderance of instances correctly. Etymology can not be avoided in a language once practically identical with the things translated. Early Pahlavi was once later Zend, and the Gāthas themselves were soon rhapsodised in a slipshod tongue. The texts were a tradition, just as the Ṛigveda is a tradition, and a marvellous one, indeed; and they each held their ground from the same quaint cause—that is to say, from metre. That there were explanations from the very first needs not to be affirmed.

Commentaries in the Zend speech as distinct from the Pahlavi first appeared (we have even some examples left to us; see Y. xix., etc.). As the language became more Pahlavi, the terminations began to crumble, as they did in English; and Pahlavi more and more, like our own MSS, took its place. Priestly earnestness assisted the degeneration of treatment. Venerable attempts were of course worked over times without number, and the latest transcriber had but little suspicion of the treasures which he revealed.

So the translations are often richest for research where they are the worst as mere renderings. What we need the most is not even their vast body of correct root-etymology, so dear to a beginner: the thing for a true constructor is the seeming heap-rubbish out of which glints here and there the gold of discoveries.

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, *July*, 1900. L. H. MILLS.

Digitized by Google

V.—NOTES ON THE MODERN MINSI-DELAWARE DIALECT.

The story of the enforced westward wanderings of the ill-fated Lenâpe[1] has been told in detail by Brinton (The Lenâpe and Their Legends, pp. 122–6).

At the present day this famous tribe, whose three clans—the Minsi, the Unami, and the Unalachtigo[2]—were once the dominant native race in Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and parts of New York State, is represented by but a few bands living on scattered reservations—some in Indian Territory and some in Ontario, Canada. The Delawares of Indian Territory have quite lost their identity as a tribe of Indians, as they have been incorporated with the Cherokee Nation, by whose chief and council they are governed. The last recognized Delaware chief of this division of the tribe was Charles Jurney-cake (Qy. Johnny-cake?), whose daughters are now married to white men. These Indians occupy lands in the Muskogee Agency situated in the northwestern part of the Cherokee Nation. There are still about eight hundred Delawares in this region, all of whom moved to the Cherokee country from Kansas, in 1867.[3] I am informed that a few members of the race linger on at New Westfield, near Ottawa, Kansas, most of whom are under the charge of the Moravian Church.

In Ontario, Canada, there are only about three hundred in all, e. g. one hundred at Hagersville, on the Six Nations' (Iroquois) Reserve (Chief Nelles Montour), one hundred at Munceytown,

[1] *Lenape* 'a male,' from *lenno* 'man' + *ape*, e. g. a man *par excellence*, 'a man of our tribe.' See Brinton, pp. 34–5, and Prince, Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc., Dec. 1899, p. 186.

[2] Brinton, p. 36, gives the following derivations: *Minsi* from *minthiŭ* 'be scattered' + *achsin* 'stone.' *Unami* 'people down the river,' from *naheu* 'down-stream'; cf. Abn. *nahiwi*. *Unalachtigo* (mod. *Wonalatoko*) 'people who live near the ocean,' from *wŭnalawat* 'go towards' and *t'kow* 'wave.' With *achsin* cf. Abn. *asen*, *sen* 'stone,' and with *t'kow* cf. Abn. *tego* 'wave' and the termination *-tekw* 'river.'

[3] I am indebted for this information to Mr. Dew M. Wisdom, formerly Indian Agent at Muskogee, I. T.

Digitized by Google

and the same number at Moraviantown, which is the seat of a Moravian mission.[1] The Canadian Delawares are all Protestants, belonging, for the most part, either to the Church of England or to the Moravians.

Brinton (op. cit., pp. 91 ff.) has pointed out the chief differences between the two ancient dialects of the Lenâpe, viz. the Unami-Unalachtigo and the Minsi. Of these, the Minsi is spoken by all the Canadian Delawares. In this connection, however, it is interesting to note that in a letter to Dr. Brinton, dated Moraviantown, 1884, Chief Gottlieb Tobias[2] states that three aged persons were then living who could still talk the other dialect. It is evident that most of the Delawares of I. T. use the Unami-Unalachtigo, as Chief Montour, of Hagersville, Ont., writes that, when he visited the Cherokee settlement of his race some years ago, he could only understand with difficulty the speech of his congeners resident there. On the other hand, he asserts that the Delawares near Ottawa, Kansas, use pure Minsi.

The following sentences and letter should be of interest to the student of Algic languages, as they represent the Minsi dialect as at present in use among the Delawares of Ontario. They were written for me, together with other material—all without grammatical comment—by Chief Nelles Montour, of Hagersville, Ont., a highly intelligent and well-educated Indian. The rather cumbrous phonetic system which he follows, while perhaps unsatisfactory from a strictly scientific point of view, is still perfectly clear and consistent. Instead of using the German notation as adopted by the Moravian missionaries, which is yet in vogue among the Delawares who belong to that Church, he spells entirely in the English style, as do all his nation who are members of the Church of England.

The following important points with regard to the pronunciation of the Delaware words cited from him should be noted: 1. Medial and final *h* is not an aspirate, but merely a pause. 2. The combination *ng* is pronounced like *ng* in 'king.' 3. The combination *rh* is a deep guttural *kh*, almost *gh*. *R* has not existed in Lenâpe since the days of the early Swedish colony in Pennsylvania and New Jersey (see Brinton, Lenape, p. 96). It is now represented by *l*. A similar change has taken place in the Abenaki idiom, as may be seen by comparing the ancient dictionary of Rasle with

[1] This is the estimate of Chief Nelles Montour, of Hagersville, Ont.

[2] Op. cit., p. 88.

Digitized by Google

the modern dialects. 4. Final *q* is pronounced like *-kw*, the *w* being whistled with a faint succeeding vowel. 5. *Th* is invariably soft as in 'with.' This sound is not indicated by the Moravians, who represent it simply by *s*, which rarely ever occurs. Their *x*, then, is really *kth*. 6. Initial *w* immediately preceding a consonant, like the same sound in Passamaquoddy, is followed by a short and unclear vowel similar to the Hebrew *sh'va mobile*. 7. Final *w*, as in the syllable *-tho-w*, should be sounded very gently. 8. *Wh* is a guttural combination composed of *w*+*kh*. 9. The vowel *i* before *l* or *sh* is a thick, unclear vowel merging into the sonant consonant. 10. The apostrophe (') indicates a very short *u*. 11. The vowels are pronounced exactly as in English.

I have not followed the syllabic division in Montour's manuscript, as this frequently obscures the composition and derivation of the words, which I have endeavored to indicate wherever possible, both by a comparison with the older dialect of the German missionaries (styled O.D. = Old Delaware) and with the kindred Algic idioms of the Abenakis and Passamaquoddies.

In the Abenaki words here given, note that *n̈* = French nasal *n* and that the inverted apostrophe (') is a gentle guttural voice-stop like the Semitic *'Ayin*. The vowels should be pronounced as in Italian and the consonants as in English, except *k*, *t*, *p*, which are voiceless *tenues*, and *j*, which has two pronunciations, e. g. *ts'* before *e* and *i*, and *dsh* before *a*, *o* and *u*.

Examples.

1. *Unisheek quawpunurheen joh* (pl. *jothuk*), O.D. *Anischik k'woapanachin n'tschu* 'Thanks for your morning, my friend (good morning).' *Woapanachin* is a participial formation containing *woapaneŭ* 'morning,' lit. 'the whitening (of the dawn).' The root *woap-* really means 'white.' Thus, *woap-aschapi-all* 'white beads' (*-all* is the inanimate plural ending), *woapaniken* 'lime.' Compare Abn. *woñbi-* 'white' and *woñban* 'daybreak,' whence the terms Del. *Wapanakhki*, Abn. *Woñbana'ki* 'land (also inhabitant) of the East,' applied to all the eastern Algic tribes.[1] *Joh* should be *n'joh*, like *n'tschu*. It is the same stem as

[1] There can be no doubt that this word means 'inhabitant of the East,' as the Abenakis use it in this sense; also *nibena'ki* 'land of the South' and 'Southerner,' from *niben* 'summer' + *a'ki* 'land.' See, however, Brinton, p. 256.

Digitized by Google

Abn. *wijia* 'his brother' and contains the root O.D. *witschi*, Abn. *weji* 'along with,' e. g. a companion; cf. Del. *witsch'man* 'to help some one'; *witsch'wot* 'he goes with him'; Abn. *wijawi* 'come with me,' etc.

2. *Ninotumin ayleerhtheyun chungeweesh. Queengah-kahkih-kloolil* 'I know your language a little. I would like to talk with you.' *Ninotumin* is 1st pers. sing. present tense of √*nowa* 'know,' e. g. *ni* = 'I' with *notum*; cf. O.D. *nowaton* (inan. form). The animate form would be *nowahan*; cf. *n'nennawa* 'I know him' (Anthony, in Len. Dict., p. 100). With this stem should be compared Pass. *n'nenoa* 'I know him,' Abn. *n'wawawinoñwoñ*. The ending *-in* in *notumin* is the sign of the definite object, as in Aben. *n'wajonem awik-higan* 'I have a book,' but *n'wajonemen awik-higan* 'I have *the* book.' *Ayleerhtheyun* is a participial form, lit. 'that which you speak,' from the same stem as *liechso-wagan* 'language'; cf. also O.D. *helleniechsin* 'to speak Indian,' from preformative syllable *he-*, *e-*+*lenno* 'man'+√*iechs* (= *eerhth*). In *ayleerhthe-yun*, *-yun* is the ending of the 2d pers.; cf. in Abn. *wa mili-yan awik-higan* 'that is the book you gave me,' e. g. *mil-* 'give' +*-i* 'to me' +*yan* 'you' (lit. 'that [is the] you-me-having-given-book'). *Queengah-kahkihkloolil* 'I would like to talk with you.' *Queengah* = *k'winga* (*k'* 'you' +*winga* 'wish'; cf. O.D. *wingi* 'willingly'). With *kahkihklool* cf. O.D. *gigilowal-an* 'to talk with some one.' The ending *-il* is the element of the 1st pers. altered from original *n*. For the combination 2d person+root+1st person, cf. *k'meel-il* 'I give you,' Abn. *k'namiol* 'I see you,' etc.

3. *Dillahkakeemquin linape talli Hagersville* 'An Indian at H. taught it to me.' The first word here, 'he taught it to me,' should probably be written like the O.D. *ndilachgegimquon*, e. g. *n'* 'to me' (a soft sonant, scarcely audible, omitted by Montour) +*d-*, always inserted between a pronominal prefix and a succeeding vowel, +*l*, frequently appearing when a root begins with a vowel (cf. Abn. *-oñd'wa* 'speak,' but *l-oñd'wa-a* 'that I speak') +*ach-gegim* 'teach' +*-quon* 'he.' With *achgegim* cf. Abn. *a'gakim* 'learn, teach,' and for the whole form cf. Abn. *n'giz-a'gakim-gon* 'he taught it to me' (*-giz-* here = *kizi* 'can'; *k* changes to *g* after *n* by partial assimilation). For the word *linape* (e. g. *lenno* 'man' +*-ape* 'male'), see above. *Talli* is pure Abenaki *tali*; *ta* 'verily, truly' +*li* 'to, at.' In Abn. it is usually suffixed: New York *tali* 'at New York.'

Digitized by Google

4. *Nweengahtumin dullahween waukah numathhan* 'I like to hunt better than to fish.' *Nweengahtumin*: *N'* = 'I' + *weengah* 'like' (see above) + *tum*, inanimate ending (cf. Abn. *n'nami'ton* 'I see it'), + *-in*, definite ending as above. *Dullahween* 'that I hunt' is for O.D. *nd-allauwin* (cf. *elawit* 'hunter') with *-d-* inserted before the vowel. The *n* suffix shows the subjunctive. *Waukah* = *wauk*, O.D. *woak* 'and' + *ah*, the sign of negation. Cf. Abn. *oñdaki* 'than,' from *oñda* 'not' + the particle *-ki*. *Numathhan* 'that I fish': *n'* + *numath* + *han*, subjunctive. With *numath* 'fish' cf. O.D. *names*, Abn. *namas*, from √ *am-oñm*, seen, for example, in *oñmawoñmuk* 'one fishes,' *nd-aman* 'I fish.' With this whole phrase cf. Abn. *npamaldamen n'nadialin oñdaki ndaman*; Pass. *Nolimusajin ng'donkan kâdik nd-aman*.

5. *Keeshahuhkeendumin ayleerhtheyun* 'you can read your language.' *Keeshah* stands for *k'* 'you' + *keeshah* 'can' (cf. Prince, Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc., Dec. 1899, p. 186). *Uhkeen* = O.D. *achgin* and *-dum* = O.D. *-dam*. The ending *-in*, as above, is definite. In O.D. the whole form would be *achgindamen*, in Abn. *agidamen*. This stem √ *achgi-agi* is undoubtedly allied with *a'gakim* 'learn, teach' (see above).

The following short letter in modern Minsi will illustrate further the peculiar construction and the vocabulary of the language:

Ahwaulilun joth:—kutuhlilin alaulowyon talli Canada kohpe tuckquauqua. Yooluk Pontiac ootani Quebec Wsheepwa ootanang. Nihluh neeshwuk moothuk. Weetuhwamuk oomba nihla myauthowhwah wlithoo. Ahpwut ahloween nih talli wauk ahwih numathihka.

Ne kjoth.

My dear friend:—I will tell you about my hunting in Canada last autumn. I went to Pontiac County, Quebec, in the Ojibway country. I killed two moose. My wife also killed a good one. The hunting is good there and the fishing is even better.

I am your friend.

With the root *ahwaul* cf. O.D. *ahoalan* 'to love some one.' *Ahwaulilun* is a participle with the ending *-il*, indicating the 1st person, and *-un*, the characteristic participial termination. *Kutuhlilin* may be analyzed thus: *k'* 'you' + *t* infixed before a vowel + *uhl* 'tell' (Abn. *k'li* 'tell me') + *-il* 'I' + the definite *-in*. *Alaulowyon*: *Al*, prefix *l* with vowel, as above in Abn. *l-oñd'wa-a*, +

Digitized by Google

aulowee 'hunt' +*yon*, 1st pers. partic. ending. *Tuckquauqua* = O.D. *tachquoak* 'autumn.' The ending *-qua* (O.D. *-qué*) shows the past relation; cf. Abn. *tagwoñgo* 'autumn,' *tagwoñgwa* 'last autumn,' *tagwoñgwiga* 'next autumn' (Minsi *tachquogike*). *Yooluk* 'I went' (cf. *aal*, Len. Dict., p. 9, 2). *Ootani* 'district, country,' usually 'a town'; cf. Abn. *odana*, Pass. *utene*. In *ootanang*, *-ang* is the regular locative ending nasalized as in the 'Algonquin'[1] and Ojibway. In Abn. and Pass. this appears as *-k*; cf. *odanak*, *utenek*.

'I killed two moose' would be in Abn. *n'nihloñ nizoak moñzak*. *Weetukwamuk* (*witawemak*) 'my wife,' lit. 'the one who lives with me,' e. g. 'my house-mate.' There is no sexual gender in the Algic languages. Cf. Abn. *nizwiak* 'my wife,' from *niz-* 'two' and *wi-wig* 'live,' seen in *k'wigin* 'you live,' *wigwôm* 'house,' etc. *Myauthowhwah* 'one' (animate) is cognate with O.D. *mejauchsit*. *Wlithoo* contains the adjective *wli* 'good' as in Abn., and Pass. *Numathihka* contains *numath* 'fish' and *ihka* (*ike*) 'there are plenty'; cf. Abn. *namasika* 'there are many fish.'

Finally, to illustrate the divergence between the older Delaware of the missionaries and the modern Minsi, I give the Lord's Prayer in both dialects, as well as in the Abenaki and Passamaquoddy. Many of the differences between the O.D. and modern Minsi are due to the fact that the older version is not in pure Minsi, but in a mixed dialect, half Unami-Unalachtigo and half Minsi.

The Lord's Prayer.

O.D.[2]: *Ki welochemelenk*[3] *talli epian awossagame.*
Mod. Minsi[4]: *Nuchwenah aipyun ahwossaukumawh.*
Thou our Father, there dwelling beyond the clouds.

Machelendasutsch ktellewunsowagan. K'sakimowagan peye-
Whaerhlindahsowitch kitisheenzwaukun. Kekiyoowaukun paya-
Praised be Thy name. Thy kingdom come

[1] The 'Algonquin' tribe is a branch of the Ojibways. The 'Algonquins' had their headquarters in former days at Oka (*Lac des Deux Montagnes*), near Montreal, but are now scattered through eastern Canada.

[2] The text of the O.D. version is quoted from Heckewelder's Indian Nations, pp. 424 ff.

[3] This is a participial form; lit. 'he who is father to us.' Cf. Ojibway *weyûsemegûyûn*.

[4] Taken from 'The Book of Common Prayer in Munsee.'

Digitized by Google

wiketsch. Ktelitehewagan leketsch yun achquidhackamike
wekitch. Lakitch aleh ta-hiyun yoon talli aukeeng
on. Thy thought happen here on earth

elgiqui leek talli awossagame. Milineen eligischquik
ailkehquee laig talli ahwosaukumawh. Melenain qui keishquik
the same as it is there above. Give to us on this day

gunagischuk achpoan woak miwelendammauwineen
wataupwaun meeyaink wauk mewalindumowhwenain
the usual bread and forgive to us our

ntschannauchsowagannena elgiqui niluna miwelendammau-
njunowhsoowaukuninahnul[1] *ailkeh neloon*[2] *mewalindumawh-*
faults the same as we mutually forgive

wenk nik tschetschanilawequengik woak katschi n'pa-
waink neik chachunehlawh-waimquaimgweik wauk chelahbawh-
them that have injured us and let-not us come that

wuneen li achquetschiechtowaganink schukund ktennineen
nain leh ahquachetoowaukunink shukquint ketinehnain
we fall into temptation, but keep us free

untschi medhicking. Alod knihillatamen ksakimowagan
winjeh matehkink. Ahloot kinnehlahtummin kekiyoowaukun
from evil. For Thou claimest Thy kingdom and

woak ktallewussowagan woak ktallowilissowagan ne
wauk pahtahweilsowaukun wauk quelowhwailmooksoowaukun leh
the power and magnificence from

wuntschi hallemiwi. Nanne leketsch.
hulmewh, wauk aupcheh. Amen.
henceforth evermore. So be it.

[1] All the Algic idioms distinguish grammatically between animate and inanimate objects. Generally speaking, the animate pl. may always be known by *-k* and the inanimate form by *-l* (*-r*, *-n* in some dialects).

[2] A distinction is made in all the Algic languages between *we = I and you* and *we = I and they*. *Niluna* (*neloon*) is the exclusive *we = I and they*. Cf. Pass. *nīlŭn*, Abn. *niūna*. The inclusive form 'I and you' is *kiluna* (*keloon*), Pass. *kīlŭn*, Abn. *kiūna*.

Digitized by Google

Abenaki.

N'mitoñgwsena Spemkik ayan soñgmoïwal meguadich aliwizian. K'tebaldamwoñgan paiomwich. K'laldamwoñgan likitoñguadich, tali kik tahoñlawi Spemkik. Noñmilina nikuoñbi pam'gisgak nedatosgiskue aboïmena ta anahaldamawina n'balaloñkawoñganenawal tahoñlawi niuna ali anahaldamawoñk palikadoñguajik. Ta akui losalina w'nemihodwoñganek, kaduinahadaki teni majigek. Ni alach.

Passamaquoddy.

N'milokwsunu Spumkik eyun: imieyucheswiktasich k'wisuwun. Kinchemuswutim pukuchihuch. Kulidùhadumuwag'n ulihach uskitkumikw stuke elihak Spumkik. Pemkiskak milin etuskiskakigewe n'tubanumun; Ha linheltumuwine nutchamag'numuwul stuke nilun eliuneltumuwugut tanik wechanmuinmuchik. Ha musak lip-hikek asiluweduwag'n ikuk. Kenuk uchisemaline lakumiksuok'n ikuk. Ibujul kukinchemusewakim ha kutupeltumwag'num ha kukichitum ituhadumuwag'n askumiu. Amen.

J. DYNELEY PRINCE.

Digitized by Google

VI.—DE *QUOQUE* ADVERBIO.

De *quoque* adverbio supervacaneum erat disserere, nisi Handii de particulis Latinis commentarii imperfecti essent; qui autem reconditiora grammaticae tractant, particulas, humilem materiam, levius saepe tangunt, ut huius vocabuli proprietas parum adhuc explicata sit. Neque enim ex grammaticis thesaurisque universum eius usum intellegere possis, neque aliunde multum addiscere licet; nam quae in editionibus A. Spengel ad Varr. L. L. V, §69, et Munro ad Lucretii locos nonnullos (cf. indicem eius s. v.), in Herma, XXIV, p. 13, de usu Propertiano Rothstein paucis verbis dixerunt, ea eiusmodi sunt ut moneant potius quam doceant.[1] Itaque cum omnia fere eius adverbii exempla, in scriptorum classicorum atque etiam priscorum libris exstantia, contulissem, non inutile putavi aliis grammaticae studiosis ad iudicandum ea subicere, quae ex illa indagatione perspicere mihi visus sum.

Principium autem sumam ex eo quod olim (A. J. P. XVIII, p. 36) dixi, cum ex exemplis apud Plautum Terentiumque repertis pro certo affirmavi, ita inter se differre *etiam* et *quoque*, ut illud cum verbo, hoc cum nomine rectius coniungeretur. Et a Terentio quidem satis manifestum est id servatum fuisse, quippe qui uno solum loco (Haut. 866) *quoque* cum participio coniungat, ceteris locis, qui, si recte vidi, octodecim sunt, post substantivum aut pronomen ponat. Plauti fabulas neque tum ita scrutatus sum, ut me nullus locus effugere deberet, neque postea ad hanc rem retractavi; quod autem tum dixi, e quinquaginta fere locis exstare quinque ubi *quoque* ad verbum pertineret, adnotare debui, uno loco (Pers. 234) verbum *ero* coniecturam tantum, quamvis probabilem, esse, altero (Cist. 315, pro quo per errorem 35 scripseram), cum *quoque* nomini adiunctum sit, tamen vim eius ad

[1] Adde tamen, in quos serius incidi, Zumpt ad Curt. VI 6 (20). 5; Vogel et ad eundem et ad alios locos et prasertim in prooemio editionis §51 e; Muetzell ad Curt. IV 2 (11). 21; Eichert, Wörterb. zu Curt., s. v. *quoque*; Weissenborn ad Liv. IV 41. 3, X 14. 9, al.; M. Mueller ad Liv. II 22. 4; Riemann, Études, p. 242. De quorum sententia, ab eis quae disputavi aliquanto diversa, non est hic disserendi locus, quoniam intra finem Ciceronianae aetatis consistere statueram.

Digitized by Google

verbum vel potius ad clausulam referendam esse, qua de re infra dicturus sum.

Quod ad alios priscorum temporum scriptores attinet, nusquam in eorum reliquiis *quoque* verbo subiectum occurrit, nisi in Nonii libris *fit q.* e Livio (fr. 30 Baehr.), pro quo certa emendatione Hermann *sic q.* scribi iussit, et apud Lucilium (XXIX 19 M. 639 B.) e Muelleri coniectura *habeas q.* pro eo quod est in libris eiusdem Nonii *habeasque.* Neque tamen huic consensui nimium tribuendum est, cum ipsa exempla pauca sint; sunt autem praeter illa quae modo commemoravi haec: Naev. b. P. 56 M. 48 B., Enn. Sat. 60 M. 529 B., Caecil. 164 R., Pacuv. 259 R., Cat. agr., §93, or. de sumtu, p. 136 Jord. (q. l. *quoque* tris positum est), cont. Cass., p. 63 J., ad M. f., p. 77 J., Lucil. X 3 M. 290 B., XXVI 93 M. 501 B., XXIX 41 M. 644 B., XXX 71 M. 762 B., inc. 106 M. 311 B., Claud. Quadr. ap. Gell. XVII 2. 18 (fr. 17 Peter).

Sed manifestior res fit, si Ciceronem aequalesque eius prosae orationis scriptores inspicias; apud quos cum in octingentis amplius locis *quoque* inveniatur, ex eis duo et viginti tantum sunt, ubi verbo subiunctum sit. Eos in certa capita distributos apposui:

1. Varr. L. L. VI 72 a qua sponte sponte dicere [cum] *re*spondere q. dixerunt.—H. l. infinitivus substantivi vicem ita explet, ut in eo nulla agendi notio insit, sed verbi quasi nomen memoretur.

2. A. Cic. Inv. I 50 rei non solum magna utilitas est sed praecipiendi q. summa difficultas. de Or. III 140 se ad dicendum q. . . . dedissent. Brut. 191 eosdem intellegentium q. iudicio fuisse probatissimos. Top. 3 non modo rebus eis . . . sed dicendi q. incredibili quadam cum copia tum suavitate. ib. 77 dormientibus q. multa significata visis. Acad. I 23 agendi q. aliquid in vita et officii ipsius initium. Off. I 159 ut dictu q. videantur turpia. (Sed N. D. III 36 *animantium q.* huc non pertinet, quoniam ex consuetudine loquendi *animans* substantivum plane factum sit.)

2. B. Rhet. ad Her. I 14 si dicam me ex provincia redisse, profectum q. in provinciam intellegitur. ib. IV 30 non solum additae sed uno tempore demptae q. litterae sunt. Cic. Inv. I 20 cum tam diversa sint genera causarum, exordiri q. dispari ratione in uno quoque genere necesse est. ib. II 59 ea igitur poena si adfici reum non oporteat, damnari q. non oportere. Div. II 110 eum quem re vera regem habebamus appellandum q. esse regem. Tusc. I 79 nihil esse quod doleat quin id aegrum esse q. possit. Fin. IV 32 ut sentire q. aliud, non solum dicere videretur. Fam. IX 17. 1 quod scire q. mihi videor. Varr. R. R. I 17. 6 commu-

Digitized by Google

nicandum q. cum eis. ib. II 2. 4 animadvertundum q. ib. II 2. 8 faciundum q. saepta.

Hi loci omnes ita inter se congruunt, ut quae ubique pars verbi adverbio antecedat, non verbum simpliciter sit sed nomen potius verbale; differunt autem, quod in posterioribus (B) verbi tamen partibus nomen verbale fungitur, in prioribus (A) nominis vicem obtinet. Uno sane loco, Acad. I 23, duplicem suam naturam gerundium exhibet, quod cum substantivo altero copulatur, alterum regit; retinendum tamen quod ad h. l. monet Reid coll. Stob. Eth. 2. 50 *ἀρχὴ τῆς ἐν τῷ βίῳ πράξεως καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ καθήκοντος*: "The Greek *πράττειν, πρᾶξις* are generally rendered by *agere aliquid* or *agendum* connected with *aliquid*, not by *agere, agendum* alone." Ergo dum per duas partes orationis una notio exprimitur, eae vocabuli unius, et eius substantivi, vicem implent.

3. Rhet. ad Her. IV 32 non modo tollitur auctoritas dicendi, sed offenditur q. in eiusmodi oratione. Varr. R. R. II 9. 13 consue q. faciunt ut alligari possint. Nep. Att. 18. 5 attigit q. poeticen.

Iam satis manifestum est, scriptores Latinos hanc particulam non nisi dubitanter cum verbo coniunxisse, qui et omnino tam raro id fecerint et apud quos tribus locis solum cum verbo finito coniuncta sit. Ex qua fortasse dubitatione singularis illa tmesis, quam in hoc Varronis loco offendimus, orta esse potest; nam qui id adverbium locis compluribus post gerundium adhibuit, tamen *consuefaciunt quoque* scribere noluit. De ceteris autem locis, ubi verbo finito *quoque* subiungitur, prior simplex, de altero quaeri potest, utrum ad solum vocabulum *poeticen* particula pertineat, ut loco mutato enclitica esse desierit, an vis eius locutionem, e verbo substantivoque confectam, totam complectatur. Quod si illud alterum fieri posse negavero, nemo fortasse erit qui non adsentiatur; tamen a re haud alienum esse arbitror, quasi ea res in quaestione esset, de huius adverbii usu quam brevissime disserere.

Is maxime perspicuus est et ad usitatam eius particulae significationem maxime accommodatus, si huius opera duo nomina inter se opponuntur, quae, in diversis clausulis posita, verbum suum quidque sed tamen idem habent. Cf. Ter. Andr. 896 *ego me amare hanc fateor; si id peccarest, fateor id q.*; Rhet. ad Her. I 27 *si plures erunt constitutiones ... iudicationes q. plures erunt.* Rarius tamen ita ad amussim omnia inter se respondent, cum et cotidianus sermo et rhetoricus sive rei sive gratiae causa varias alterius clausulae mutationes adhibeant. Subaudiri enim potest

Digitized by Google

ea quae *quoque* non habet clausula, aut tota (ut Ter. Ph. 858), aut verbum eius (quod semper fere fit, si ea clausula per *ut* particulam inducitur; cf. Cic. R. A. 82; Varr. L. L. V 96); deinde autem ea quae *quoque* continet clausula per verbum aliud, sed quod idem fere significet, exprimitur. Cf. Plaut. Men. 796–8 *ita istaec solent, quae viris subservire sibi postulant, dote fretae, feroces. et illi q. haud abstinent saepe culpa*: ubi verba *haud abstinent culpa* idem fere dicunt quod praecedentia, nisi quod mulieribus certum peccatum tribuitur, in viris peccandi notio generaliter effertur. Levius etiam, mutato verbo, sensus mutatur in Plaut. Asin. 114; Rhet. ad Her. IV 45; Cic. Att. I 5. 1; II 7. 1; contra gravior mutatio fit in Cic. Att. I 17. 1 *illud a me intellegebatur quod te q. ipsum suspicari videbam*; cum enim in utroque verbo sentiendi notio insit, tamen haudquaquam idem est intellegere ac suspicari.

Sed per hanc particulam non solum vocabulum vocabulo sed etiam locutio locutioni opponitur; quem usum, nemini certe incognitum, grammatici neglexerunt, editorum pauci quos sciam attigerunt, ut Munro ad Lucr. IV 352; Greenough ad Hor. S. I 10. 5; Wickham ad Hor. S. II 8. 81.[1] Constat talis locutio interdum ex nominibus variis modis inter se coniunctis (cf. Rhet. ad Her. I 27; Varr. R. R. I 72; Cic. Inv. I 3. 59. 91, Quinct. 49, R. C. 50, Fam. VIII 5. 1), interdum etiam ex substantivo et verbo. Et hic quidem usus in Plaut. Cist. 315, *non modo ipsa lepidast: commode q. hercle fabulatur*, rudis, ut ita dicam, et imperfectus est; nam cum idem fere significent *lepida* et *commode* vocabula, particulae vis re vera potius ad verbum *fabulatur* pertinet quam ad id cui adhaeret adverbium; sed tamen ita posita totam notionem complecti videtur. Quod in his etiam magis fit:

Cic. Inv. I 80 si aut perspicue falsum erit . . . aut ex contrario q. credibile aliquid habebit (sed ibid. II 48 *quoque* solum ad verba *ex contrario* pertinet). ibid. II 4 quare stultitia visa est aut a bene inventis alicuius recedere, si quo in vitio eius offenderemur, aut ad vitia eius q. accedere, cuius aliquo bene praecepto duceremur. *Aut quoque* = *aut etiam* = ἢ καί.

Rhet. ad Her. I 25 non modo imperasse sed rationem q. ostendisse; ibid. IV 33 (cf. Cic. Inv. I 109); ibid. IV 34; Cic. de Or. II 47; Fam. III 8. 9 si umquam mea causa quicquam aut sensit aut fecit, de hac q. sententia bima decedat; ibid. IV 2. 3 (cf. Or. 208), IV 11. 1, X 33. 4, XII 14. 7; Att. XIV 3. 2 volunt enim nos ita putare; nescio cur non animo q. sentiant; R. A. 126.

[1] Sed vid. etiam quos supra in adnotatione laudavi.

Digitized by Google

Paulo diversum hoc est: Ter. Haut. 417–419 *item ut filium meum amico atque aequali suo video inservire . . . nos q. senes est aequom senibus obsequi*; nam inter verba *inservire* et *obsequi* nihil interest, quae autem inter se notiones opponuntur, ex subiecto obiectoque constant. Eiusdem generis hoc est: Cic. Fam. III 8. 6 *cum te absentem semper defenderim, cum praesertim mihi usu venturum non arbitrarer*, ut *ego q. a te defendendus essem*, nisi quod in altera clausula primae sententia invertitur; cf. etiam Fam. III 2. 1, 3. 2, Top. 5. Neque aliter accipiendum est Cic. Att. VI 1. 22 *filiola tua gratum mihi fecit, quod tibi diligenter mandavit ut mihi salutem adscriberes, gratum etiam Pilia . . . igitur tu q. salutem utrique adscribito*; non enim ad pronomen, cui adhaeret particula, vis eius pertinet, sed mutuae salutationes inter se opponuntur. Quod autem locum quem non debebat particula obtinet, eius rei etiam alia exempla sunt, ut Ter. Andr. 455, et maxime apud Varronem. Qui cum dicit, L. L. VIII 84, *hinc q. illa nomina*, recte monet Rothstein l. l. ne sic intellegamus, quasi dicere Varro voluerit, et aliunde et hinc illa nomina ducta esse, sed eum illis quoque nominibus, sicut aliis, hanc originem tribuere. Huius rei exempla et ab O. Muellero et ab A. Spengelio congesta esse Rothstein testatur; sed pauca Mueller ad L. L. V 69, plura ad eund. l. Spengel affert, qui sic loquitur: "De *quoque* non suo loco posito conf. §§56, 181, 182; VI, §§69" (leg. 60), "89; VIII, §84." Adde etiam L. L. VII 91, VIII 62 (cf. Rhet. ad Her. I 14); R. R. I 8. 2, 18. 4, 24. 4, 29. 3.

Id autem Varro fecit, non quin encliticae naturam agnosset, sed quia particula, post primum locutionis membrum posita, locutionem totam vi sua afficere poterat. Nobis quidem mirum videri potest, si interdum (ut L. L. VIII 84) particulam ita posuit, ut ei vocabulo cui plane non debebatur pondus accresceret: at eodem modo Cicero egit, cum Quinct. 49 ita locutus est: *mors honesta saepe vitam q. turpem exornat.* Nam in locutione quae est *vitam turpem* turpitudinis notio principalis est, ut ille substantivo pondus praeter debitum addidisse videatur. Talia autem ratione non reguntur, sed ex loquendi consuetudine magis pendent.

Hac excusatione etiam Horatius uti poterat, cum S. I 10. 5 ita scripsit: *nec tamen hoc tribuens dederim q. cetera*; nam etsi verba *tribuens* et *dederim* plane eandem notionem continent, tamen quia in ea notione exprimenda non idem quo ante usus erat verbum repetivit, idcirco ei sic rem accipere licuit, quasi re vera clausulae componerentur. Neque tamen negaverim, in poetis

Digitized by Google

quoque metri causa transponi; saltem in Lucretio id agnoscas, qui in re nova et difficili tractanda facere aliquando non poterat quin patrio sermoni vim quandam afferret. Sed ei licentiam, quam in hoc vocabulo sibi sumpsit, iam sermo illorum temporum dabat; nec mirum si, ut poeta, licentia accepta nonnunquam fortasse abusus est. De Prop. IV (V) 4. 52 iudicare non ausim; eiusdem I 12. 18, II (III) 4. 85, III (IV) 11 (10). 65 bene Rothstein cum usu Varroniano potius quam cum Lucretiano confert. Sed, ut ad priscorum temporum scriptorem redeamus, maiore licentia Plautus egit, Asin. 184–5 *volt etiam ancillis, et quoque catulo meo subblanditur novos amator*; nulla enim metri necessitate coactus est id facere (nam *et etiam* scribere potuit, ut Cist. 522 in quinto pede septenarii fecit); sed cum in hoc versu *etiam* semel iam posuisset, auribus obsecutus neglegentiam inauditam, non ingratam, admisit.

Atque de hoc adverbio, ubi ad clausulam pertinet, idem dicere licet, quod antea (A. J. P. XVIII, p. 32 *d*) de *etiam* particula dixi; addendi enim vim nonnunquam paene abicit et id tantum, vel maxime, efficit, ut sententia maiore pondere et quasi vocis intentione efferatur. In quo genere nonnulli ex locis supra laudatis sunt, ut Ter. Andr. 455 *tu q. perparce* (deest *emisti*, et dicere vult, re vera eum perparce emisse); ut Varr. L. L. V 182 *stipendium a stipe dictum, quod aes q. stipem dicebant*; non enim ad *stipem* particula pertinet, ut e Spengelii adnotatione colligendum erat, sed ea adiuncta res expressius affirmatur. Cf. etiam Cic. Inv. I 18 *qua re omnis controversia q. sublata est* (secludit Friedrichs, retinet Kayser); ibid. 66 *quare neutra q. indiget approbatione.*

Paucis comicorum locis *etiam* poni affirmavi (A. J. P. XVIII, pp. 31–2), ubi *contra* potius exspectes; et sic fortasse *quoque* accipiendum est uno loco, Cic. Inv. II 33 *ex dispari q. genere culparum, si ex pari sumendi facultas non erit, improbare animum adversarii oportebit.* Qui cum rarissimus sit usus, e Graeca lingua deductus esse potest: cf. Xen. A. I 5. 13 ὥστ' ἐκείνους ἐκπεπλῆχθαι . . . καὶ τρέχειν ἐπὶ τὰ ὅπλα· οἱ δὲ καὶ ἔστασαν ἀποροῦντες τῷ πράγματι; cf. ib. II 3. 23 καὶ εὖ ποιῶν, III 1. 12 πῇ δὲ καὶ ἐφοβεῖτο.

Atque in hoc adverbio considerando alia etiam Graeca in mentem recurrunt; quis enim, si apud Ciceronem *scire quoque* legit, non de talibus cogitat qualia sunt τοῦτο δὴ καὶ περαίνω, Dem. IV 28, et τί γὰρ καὶ φήσομεν; Plat. Euthyphr. 6 B? Et si *quare*

Digitized by Google

neutra quoque indiget legas, in promptu est conferre ὅπερ οὖν καὶ ἔπαθεν, Plat. Euthyphr. 4 D, et ὥσπερ καὶ δίκαιον, Philem. 156 Kock; neque non ut in Cic. Fam. III 8. 6 sententia invertitur, sic etiam in Xen. An. I 4. 16 ἐγὼ μὲν . . . ὑμᾶς ἐπαινῶ· ὅπως δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐμὲ ἐπαινέσετε. Temere statim affirmaveris, haec apud Latinos non nisi ex aemulatione Graecorum potuisse oriri; sed tamen in Graeco sermone particulae maxime florent, quibus Latinae linguae gravitas minus favet, et operae pretium est cognoscere, in Catonis de agri cultura libro semel tantum ***quoque*** occurrere, semel etiam (Iug. 79) in Sallustii libris, qui scriptor et gravitatem vere Romanam captavit et Catonis sectator fuit. At contra Varro, homo et litteris Graecis doctissimus et doctrinae magis quam elegantiae studiosus, in hac particula liberrime egit; quae cum minus quam ***etiam*** gravitatis habeat, paene eodem modo quo καὶ monosyllabon sententiae se insinuare et Graecam levitatem referre videtur. Certe liberior eius usus ex eo in primis fluxit, quod, postquam ***etiam*** pro ***quoque*** cum substantivis coniunctum est, hoc, ut ***etiam***, ad clausulam pertinere atque etiam cum verbo coniungi coepit; sed ambas particulas licentius usurpatas esse mihi persuasum est quia saepissime notionem e Graeco petitam exprimere deberent.

GUILELMUS HAMILTON KIRK.

Digitized by Google

VII.—A PAPYRUS FRAGMENT OF ILIAD E.

A small group of literary papyri came into my hands at Cairo in February of the present year, in the course of six weeks spent there in work on Greek papyri in the Gizeh Museum. The dealer through whom they were secured said that they came from Ashmunên. Among the pieces was what Mr. Kenyon has called "the inevitable Homer." The papyrus is very small, measuring 9.5 by 4.8 cm., but so fine is the writing which completely covers it, that eighteen lines of the fifth book of the Iliad are represented upon it. These occupy the *recto*. On the *verso* are parts of two columns, written in a bold, rude cursive. The ends of thirteen lines of the first column and the initial letters of five of the second are preserved. The name 'Ορ]σενοῦφιν, column I, l. 11, betrays the non-literary character of the columns, of which these are the remains:

Verso, column I:

].	]θησεται	]αιποις	]σαν	]νθα	]ν τοπον	].πικει
].πας	]ωνη	]ταστη	Ορ]σενουφιν	]τω	]ειπεν	

Column II:

ρ.[	π[	φ[	ϵ[	τ[

The writing of the Iliad verses on the *recto* is a very fine and neat back hand of the semi-uncial type. This hand has led Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt, to whom the papyrus has been submitted, to assign it to the middle or latter part of the second century, when in the time of the Antonines such hands came into vogue. The upper stroke of *α* is much prolonged, and the loop is rather reduced in size. The letter thus somewhat resembles the alphas of the first hand in the British Museum manuscript of Isocrates *On the Peace*, assigned by Mr. Kenyon to the first century[1]; and still more the alphas of the British Museum

[1] Kenyon, Classical Texts from Papyri in the British Museum, pl. IV.

Digitized by Google



ILIAD E 824–841.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Odyssey, which Mr. Kenyon refers to the early first century.[1] The loops of β are distinct from each other. In ε the upper curve often meets the cross-stroke, giving the letter much the appearance of a modern English e; sometimes the lower curve also meets the cross-stroke, when the letter is indistinguishable from θ. In η the cross-stroke passes well to the left of the left vertical, while the right vertical has become a short but decided curve hanging from the right end of the cross-stroke. In ο and the letters of similar outline—ε c θ—the form is rather oval, the axis pointing not straight up, but decidedly to the left, until it sometimes becomes almost horizontal. This is indeed the prime characteristic of the hand, and in it ι and all the vertical strokes of the angular letters share. χ is small, ρ and φ being the only letters which go below the line. ψ and ξ do not occur. The letters are all completely formed, but they are often joined together. Whether the dative ι was written in the papyrus is not quite clear. Only in βριθοσύνῃ 839 should we expect it, and here it was not originally written; but it seems to have been supplied, together with a point—perhaps by another hand—just above η. The stroke above ω of πρώην 832 is probably similarly intended, and is doubtless due to the same corrector, who thought of πρωί and wished πρώην spelled etymologically. Yet it is just possible that in 832 an acute accent is meant, in which case it must come from another hand than the rest of the accents in the fragment; and that in 839 some scholiast wrote ·ι· above η, with reference to a scholium in the margin. Didymus has a comment on this line, but it does not concern βριθοσύνῃ; it reads: διὰ τοῦ δὲ αἱ Ἀριστάρχου ἄνδρα δ' ἄριστον.[2]

The papyrus has a fair array of points and accents, generally from the first hand. The rough breathing occurs twice—836 and 840. The acute appears frequently, in the case of diphthongs standing over both vowels. It stands usually on antepenults, but σύ 827 and τοίη 828 also have it. A feature somewhat less common is the marking of α-long: ἄ′ρηα 827, ἄ′ρηϊ 829, 841, ἐρύσᾱσ (ἐρύσασα) 836. In 824, on the other hand, the initial α of Ἄρηα is short and is, of course, unmarked. ἐρύσᾱσ was probably marked to prevent confusion with ἔρυσας, although the apostrophe would have done as well. The diaeresis is used with its modern force,

[1] Kenyon, Palaeography of Greek Papyri, pl. XV, p. 84.

[2] La Roche, Ilias, p. 159.

Digitized by Google

and elision is sometimes indicated by the apostrophe. The high point is the only punctuation-mark—828, 830, 838, and possibly 839. In 830, modern editions have a comma; in the other lines they have a colon.

The fragment furnishes few interesting readings. Naturally, it is the Vulgate text that is represented. γινώσκων 824 is probably an error for γινώσκω. It is unsupported by the manuscripts, and the editors read γιγνώσκω or γινώσκω, which the sense obviously requires. σθενελος 835 is equally unintelligible, and seems to have no support, editors and manuscripts reading Σθένελον. Yet the superior iotas in 832 and 839 shew that the papyrus has had at least one corrector, and one wonders why he was not thoroughgoing. In the case of γινώσκων, indeed, it is probable the ν was marked for excision. There is an additional stroke in the middle of it, which may be thus interpreted. The stroke with which the corrector deleted the α of μαχήσασθαι 833 is hardly more noticeable. But σθενελος shews no trace of the corrector's hand, while the line can hardly be restored in such a way as to justify the nominative.

The corrector has again asserted himself in 833, where he writes ε above the penultimate α of μαχήσασθαι. In this he has the approval of most modern editors, who print μαχήσεσθαι. There are a number of manuscripts, however, which have the reading of the first hand. The papyrus betrays no consciousness of Aristonicus' rejection of 838, 839; but the margins might tell a different story. The reading in 840 is not quite certain. Apparently the first hand wrote μαστειγα, in which the corrector deleted the ε.

In the following transcription the lacunae are supplied from the text of Leaf, except that, in view of the usage of the papyrus, the dative iotas are omitted. Accents, breathings, points, and marks of quantity are printed only where they occur in the papyrus. A point under a letter means that the reading is not quite certain; a line, that the corrector has marked the letter as wrong.

Ε 824–841:

γινωσ]κων γαρ αρηα μ[αχην ανα κοιρανεοντα
825 τον δ η]μείβετ' επειτ[α θεα γλαυκωπις αθηνη
τυδειδ]η διομηδες ε[μω κεχαρισμενε θυμω
μητε σ]ύ γ' ᾱ'ρηα το γε δε[ιδιθι μητε τιν αλλον
αθανατ]ων· τοίη τοι εγ[ων επιταρροθος ειμι

Digitized by Google

αλλ αγ]επ ᾱ′ρηϊ πρωτω [εχε μωνυχας ιππους
τυψον] δε σχεδιην· μη[δ αζεο θουρον αρηα
τουτο]ν μαινομενον τ[υκτον κακον αλλοπροσαλλον
ος πρ]ωτ'ην μεν εμοι τ]ε και ηρη στευτ αγορευων
τρωσι] μαχήσασθαι αταρ [αργειοισιν αρηξειν
νυν δ]ε μετα τρώεσσιν [ομιλει των δε λελασται
ως φα]μενη σθενελος [μεν αφ ιππων ωσε χαμαζε
χειρι] παλιν ερύσᾱσ ὁ δ' α[ρ εμμαπεως απορουσεν
η δ ες] διφρον εβαινε π[αραι διομηδεα διον
εμμεμα]νια θεα· μεγα δ' εβ[ραχε φηγινος αξων
βριθ]οσυνη·· δε[ι]νην γα[ρ αγεν θεον ανδρα δ αριστον
λαζετ]ο δε μαστε[ι]γα και ή[νια παλλας αθηνη
αυτικ επ] ᾱ′[ρηι πρωτω εχε μωνυχας ιππους

824 γινωσκω Leaf; γιγνώσκω Dindorf, La Roche, Van Leeuwen.
827 το γε; τόν γε J (*supr.* τό), OQT (R *supr.*), Vrat. a[1], Eust.; τόνδε S Lips. Mosc. 3; τὸν M.
831 τυκτον; στυκτὸν Van Leeuwen.
832 πρωην *man. prim.* Dindorf.
πρωιην *corr.* Leaf; πρῴην La Roche, Van Leeuwen *c.* AEG.
833 μαχήσασθαι *man. prim.* HLOP(?)QR, Vr. A, Mosc. 3.
μαχήσεσθαι *corr.* Dindorf, La Roche, Leaf.
μάχεσθαι G (*supr.* ασ); μαχέσασθαι Vr. a. μαχέσσεσθαι Van Leeuwen.
αταρ; αὐτὰρ JMQR.
835 σθενελος; Σθένελον Dindorf, La Roche, Van Leeuwen, Leaf, etc.
836 ερύσᾱσ; ἐρύσασα D.
838, 839 ἀθετοῦνται Aristonicus.
839 Van Leeuwen puts this verse in the margin.
840 δε; δὴ G[2]; γὰρ H.
μαστειγα *man. prim.*; μαστιγα *corr.*, Dindorf, La Roche, Van Leeuwen, Leaf, etc.

The great papyrus representative of the fifth book of the Iliad is CCXXIII of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri,[1] written early in the third century on the *verso* of the long document known as the 'Petition of Dionysia to the Praefect.' The *verso* preserves eleven complete columns and considerable parts of seven others—in all,

[1] Grenfell and Hunt, Oxyrhynchus Papyri, II, pp. 96–114.

Digitized by Google

376 lines, the last of which is 705. The British Museum fragments grouped under the number CXXVII (1) include three small pieces from E which Mr. Kenyon has described in his Classical Texts,[1] and which in his Palaeography[2] he refers, though not positively, to the second century. They comprise lines 731–743,[3] 815–818, and 846–850. The present fragment is thus one of the two oldest representatives of Iliad E as yet announced, and the only published papyrus witness for the lines it preserves.

EDGAR J. GOODSPEED.

[1] Kenyon, Classical Texts from Papyri in the British Museum, pp. 98, 99.

[2] Kenyon, Palaeography of Greek Papyri, p. 139.

[3] Mr. Kenyon kindly supplies me with this correction in the description of the first fragment, which has through a misprint been published as containing lines 731–734 only.

Digitized by Google

NOTE.

THE ETYMOLOGY OF ΣΘΕΝΟΣ.

Prellwitz, in his Etymological Dictionary, under the word σθένος, assigns it, together with σθεναρός and σθένω, to a root √ *sthenō*, and connects with them Norse *stinnr* 'firm, strong,' Anglo-Saxon *stíð*. The connection of the Germanic words with σθένος is also assumed by Streitberg, Urgerm. Gram., p. 114.

The root √ *sthenō* is evidently postulated ad hoc, and very unnecessarily. The only occurrence of σθεναρός in Homer is the late passage I 505, after which it is taken up by the tragic poets; and it was most probably coined from σθένος after the model of βριαρός.[1]

On the other hand, σθένω is not a fully developed verbal system —only forms of present and imperfect are quoted—and is confined to the tragic poets, and to late epic poetry and prose. I believe it is called forth by the fact that μένος, which is associated with σθένος both in sound and meaning, had by its side μένω in the sense 'to stand firm' in battle. So that we are left with σθένος for the starting-point of this group of words, and the probability is that its isolated position is due to the operation of phonetic laws that have concealed its original relationship.

If Zubaty is right in maintaining that the Greek reflex of Indo-European *sth-* is στ- (cf. KZ. XXXI 4 f.), the connection of σθένος, *stinnr*, *stíð* is demonstrably wrong. Zubaty's suggestion that it is to be connected with *dhána-* 'kampfesbeute' (l. c., p. 4, note) is, as he points out, objectionable on account of Avestan *gaodana-*, and has, besides, little to recommend it.

The words with which one would like to associate σθένος are the group Sanskrit *sahas*, Avestan *hazō*, Gothic *sigis*. The root from which these words are derived is represented in Greek by ἔχω and its derivatives, and may be reconstructed as **seĝhe-* in its Indo-European form. The variation of palatals and gutturals is well recognized; cf. Brugmann, Grund. I² 547; Noreen, Abriss,

[1] As βριαρός has no noun by its side, the new formation is etymologically clearer, and hence more serviceable.

Digitized by Google

p. 199, and the literature cited there. Beside this root *seĝhe-* we find forms with a guttural (cf. Hirt, Der idg. Ablaut, §495): Sanskrit *ásaghnos* (RV. i. 31, 3), *asaghnor bhāram* 'thou didst overcome the burden,' *sahvan-* 'powerful,' Greek ἐχυρός, ὀχυρός, Old High German *sigu*, Gothic *sihu*, miswritten for **sigu*. As the labialization of a labio-velar guttural disappears, both in Greek and Germanic, before a following *u-*, we may reconstruct **seghe̯u-* for the Indo-European root. A third form, **seghe-* (possibly a contamination of the two preceding forms), is vouched for by Sanskrit *saghat*, RV. i. 57, 4, and this with loss of the vowel of the first syllable—a type recognized for this category; cf. Hirt, op. cit., §843—and the suffix *-nos* yields **zghé-nos*, which in turn will become in Greek σθένος.

For the suffix **-nos* cf. Latin *pĭg-nus*, Sanskrit *rek-ṇas*, and Brugmann, Grund. II 389. Such picking up of a preceding sound by a suffix must rest on a false division of a word in which the sound belongs to the stem; compare, e. g., *ego-tism* : *despotism*, *tobacco-nist* : *pian-ist*. In the present case the starting-point for σθέ-νος may perhaps be found in the closely associated μέν-ος.

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA.

Digitized by Google

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Griechische Grammatik (Lautlehre, Stammbildungs- und Flexionslehre und Syntax), von Dr. KARL BRUGMANN. Dritte Auflage. München, 1900.

The appearance of a new edition of Brugmann's Greek Grammar, thoroughly revised, and enlarged to more than double the size of the previous edition, is an event of prime importance. The last decade has been unusually productive of Greek grammars of large scope, but none of these serves the same purpose as Brugmann's grammar. The Kühner-Blass furnishes the most complete collection of the actual facts of the language, but with meagre or often antiquated explanation of the historical development. The Historical Greek Grammar of Jannaris is of value on the side of mediaeval and modern Greek, but in its historical treatment of ancient Greek and the dialects is hardly more than a piece of dilettantism. Except for the syntax, Gustav Meyer's Griechische Grammatik was once a rival of Brugmann's as an historical grammar, and, although its author never grappled with the problems with quite the same incisiveness and *savoir faire* as Brugmann, its greater fullness gave it a certain advantage. But the last edition of Meyer's grammar was a distinct disappointment. One feels that the author, whose illness was perhaps already approaching, tried to introduce the new material which had come to light since the previous edition, and the new literature on many questions, with the least possible amount of revision. New citations were often added mechanically to the old paragraphs, when these should properly have been thoroughly revised in the light of the additions. The result was a work which is neither fish nor fowl: as a collection of material it is less complete than the Kühner-Blass, and as an historical grammar it is no longer up to date.

The new edition of Brugmann, on the other hand, with its complete revision and great increase in size, is substantially a new work, and beyond all question is *the* historical grammar of the Greek language. Here, as elsewhere, the author combines a mastery of the material, remarkable for one whose field of work is necessarily so wide, with the keenest critical judgment and great power of systematization. Professor Brugmann is nothing if not systematic, so much so that his worship of system has been made the object of criticism. But consistency and a respect for system are invaluable qualities in dealing with the multiplicity of details and the chronological complications incident to the study

Digitized by Google

of historical grammar, and the lack of them depreciates the value of much otherwise brilliant work. In disputed questions, of which there are still so many, one may differ from this or that conclusion or may regard many an explanation as so uncertain as to be little better than a *non liquet*, but one may be fairly certain that the view adopted by Brugmann offers a working hypothesis which has been thought out in all its bearings.

It is an interesting question how widely Brugmann's grammar, in its treatment of the sounds and forms, has been and will be used by Greek scholars in general, those who have no special training or interest in comparative grammar, but who would be glad to assimilate its important results in the field of Greek. Surely no fault can be found with the manner of presentation, which is clear and precise. As for practical phonetics, no greater knowledge is demanded than is possessed by every trained student of modern languages, and should be expected equally of every student of the classics. Forms from other languages are of course cited here and there, but the pages are not so overloaded with these as to repel one who is not acquainted with Sanskrit, Old Bulgarian, etc. As for the general principles of linguistic development, a knowledge of which is, as the author emphasizes, more important than an acquaintance with Sanskrit, they are discussed briefly but clearly in the Introduction. If after all it is true, as we hope it is not, that the grammar remains a sealed book to many classical scholars, the reason can be only in the nature of the subject. No thoroughgoing treatment of the historical development is possible without a degree of subtlety and complexity which may well produce a feeling of confusion in the reader, unless offset by a more severe application to the subject than many are willing to give. Scientific progress in this field sometimes helps to a simpler and more comprehensive statement, but oftener it involves subtler distinctions, minuter subdivisions and more limited conditions than it was previously thought necessary to assume. This increasing complexity shows itself in many of the changes made in the work under review, e. g. in the treatment of Att. $\bar{a}$ (§10), of the change of τ to σ (§48), of the forms of comparison (§230), etc., etc. It is of course feasible to produce a brief historical grammar of Greek with emphasis on the more certain and obvious phases of development, but it is the fuller treatment, not a primer, that we expect and welcome from Brugmann.

The Introduction and the chapters on Phonology, Stem-Formation and Inflection, which form the subject of this review, occupy 362 pages as against 176 in the previous edition. The least change is in the Introduction. Two pages on the relation of Greek Grammar to Comparative Grammar are omitted, and the section on Methodology is correspondingly increased by the consideration of certain real or alleged limitations to the principle of the invariability of the phonetic laws. The impossibility of formu-

Digitized by Google

lating laws for such processes as assimilation or dissimilation of sounds not actually contiguous, haplology, etc., is attributed by the author to the peculiar and often isolated character of the individual cases, rather than to any difference in principle. The reviewer has been in the habit of accounting for this on the ground that in such changes the psychological element was so strong as to make them closely allied to the processes grouped under the name of analogy, processes which, admittedly, can not strictly be brought under laws in the sense in which the term is applied to mechanical sound-changes.

The sketch of the dialects is substantially unchanged. It is conceded that the classification given is one of convenience, and, like any other, is inadequate to represent fully the interrelations of the dialects. It may be suggested, however, that a paragraph might profitably be inserted, calling attention to some of the important points which the classification disguises, or at least does not bring out, e. g. that Boeotian, though put properly enough under the Aeolic group, might with almost equal propriety be classed with the Northwest Greek dialects, there being in fact a gradual shading off from Aeolic to Doric characteristics between Lesbian, Thessalian, Boeotian, Old Phocian and Locrian; or, again, that the Northwest Greek group stands in the closest relation to the Doric group,[1] possessing, as it does, the common characteristics of the Doric dialects (e. g. δίδωτι, φέροντι, φέρομες,

[1] There can be no question that the term North Doric, used by many scholars for what others call Northwest Greek, is *linguistically* appropriate. This fact is not given due weight by those historians who reject *in toto* the story of the Dorian invasion. Beloch's attempt, Griechische Geschichte, I, p. 62, to evade the evidence of the dialects can only be characterized as trivial. He recognizes with others that Arcadian is a relic of a dialect which once extended to the eastern and southern coasts, and of which Cyprian is an offshoot. The fact that in historical times the dialects of Argolis and Laconia are totally different he attributes to "the influence of intercourse with Greeks of other regions," and the further fact that these two dialects are closely akin to one another he says "is to be expected, considering their common origin." Unfortunately, most of the characteristics common to these dialects, and to those of the colonies as well, are not such as are found in Arcado-Cyprian. Beloch had better have put it the other way, and said "they are alike, as is to be expected, considering that they were subject to the same external influence." But what was this outside influence which so transformed the old dialects? There is evidence of Ionic influence on the coast of Argolis. Was it, then, Ionic influence? Unfortunately, again, in those characteristics in which the dialects of Argolis, etc., differ from Arcado-Cyprian, Ionic is nearer the latter. Did Arc.-Cypr. φέρονσι revert to φέροντι under the influence of Ion. φέρο(ν)σι? Did the Arc.-Cypr. infin. in -ναι give way to -μεν under the influence of Ion. -ναι, etc.? No. The outside influence must have been such as to produce dialects differing as widely as possible from both Arcado-Cyprian and Attic-Ionic, but bearing the closest resemblance to the dialects of Northwest Greece. And whence came this influence if not through immigration—not indeed from the little land of Doris alone, but from the great Northwest! As some one has remarked apropos of Beloch's view, the fact that one can explain how a tradition *might have* arisen without historical foundation is a long way from proving that it did so arise. The general conception of the Doric invasion is too strongly supported by linguistic and other evidence to be so easily overthrown.

Digitized by Google

numerals in -κάτιοι, πρᾶτος, τέτορες, κα, γα, etc.), and differing from the Doric dialects no more than these differ among themselves (the only important differences are the dat. pl. in -οις for cons. stems, found in Locrian in common with Elean, but not in Old Phocian, and the use of ἐν cum acc., which the Doric dialects have replaced by ἐν-ς or its descendant).

Further comments must be brief.

§10, Anm. 2. κρήνη and εἰρήνη are not from κρᾱ́νᾱ and εἰρᾱ́νᾱ, but from by-forms with original ē. For the former cf. Kretschmer, l. c.; for the latter note the appearance of εἰρήνᾱ on Lesbian and Cretan inscriptions (G. Meyer[3], p. 98), and, now, in Delphian (Collitz, No. 2502, with Baunack's note, p. 662). Although the contrast between Att.-Ion. η and ᾱ in other dialects is of course due in the great majority of cases to the retention of original ᾱ in the latter, yet the dialectic preference for the *e* and *a*-sounds respectively, when once established, shows itself also in the unconscious choice of doublets, sometimes even in the case of the corresponding short vowels, e. g. Dor. κα, γα, ὅτα, ἰαρός, etc.

§17. A new example of the use of ο for ϝ is seen in ὁλοαῖς (Att. ὁλαί, Hom. οὐλαί, ὀλβα- in glosses), on an inscription of Lycosura published by Leonardos, Ἐφ. Ἀρχ., 1898, pp. 249 ff.

The most decisive example of a genuine Ionic ϝ (i. e. not merely the letter ϝ, used for the glide sound, as in ἀϝυτοῦ) is furnished by the form Ἀγεσιλεϝο, from an inscription on a Proto-Corinthian lekythos in the possession of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts.[1] This bears out the conclusion of Thumb, IF. IX 323, that it is unnecessary to question the reading of the Naxian ϝι[φ]ικαρτίδης.

§30. One would be glad of an explanation of Delphian κῆναν or κηΰαν 'burnt-offering.'

P. 57, footnote. Hoffmann's explanation of Κλεομπόρου as from *Κλεο-εμπόρου is declared impossible. But if the process of elision, which originated in sentence-combination, has extended to the first member of compounds so as to become a regular feature in composition (§132), why may not the opposite process of aphaeresis, which Brugmann admits in sentence-combination (§141), also make its appearance in composition? Such a supposition would also allow us to explain δᾱμιοργός (Dor., Locr., El., Arcad.) from δᾱμιο-εργός, without resorting to *δᾱμιο-οργός (§55, Anm. 2), against which may be urged the absence of any other evidence for the existence in Greek of an *o*-grade form of this root. The contracted forms δημιουργός and *δᾱμιωργός (Heracl. ἀμπελωργικός) do not, of course, require -οργός. The conditions producing such aphaeresis in place of elision would still remain obscure, but no more so than in sentence-combination. The whole matter, as well as the phenomenon discussed in §48, deserves further investigation.

[1] An account of this lekythos was given in a paper read by Professor Tarbell at a meeting of the Amer. Phil. Association, July, 1900.

Digitized by Google

P. 62. "Dor. el. äol. ᾱ aus ᾰο und aus ᾱο, ᾱω." This is the accepted view, but leaves unexplained such forms as Selinuntian νικῶμες, νικῶντι (Collitz, 3046; early 6th cent., so no possibility of Att. influence such as is claimed for Boeot. σουλῶντες), Locr. συλῶντα, etc., further Heracl. τετρῶρον, πᾱμωχέω, and the numerous examples of Doric proper names in Ἀγλω- (G. Meyer[3], p. 205). If we assume that just as we have Dor. η from αε, but ᾱ from ᾱε, so Dor. ω from ᾰο, but ᾱ from ᾱο, the forms mentioned are in order, e. g. πᾱμῶχος from *πᾱμά-οχος : πολιᾶχος (Loc.) from πολιᾰ́-οχος (Pindar), just as τῑμήτω from τῑμαέτω : ἅλιος from ἀέλιος. Of the alleged examples of ᾱ from ᾰο, Boeot. φῡσᾶντες can come from φῡσᾰ́οντες belonging to the type of presents in -ᾰ́ω, -ήω, -ώω (cf. Boeot. δᾱμιώοντες), similarly Arg. καταγελάμενος, unless one takes this with Brugmann (§322) from a present γέλαμι, in which case it would not enter into the question. The only difficulty is with the forms of the 2d sing. aor. mid., like ἐπᾱ́ξᾱ. As such forms are known only from Theocritus and a grammatical notice, there is a possibility that they are 'hyper-Doric,' but, waiving this, they may be attributed to qualitative levelling with the other forms of the same tense.

§48, Anm. To ἄλίασσις and the other Argive forms with σσ may now be added Boeot. ἀγόρασσις from an inscription of Tanagra, published by Reinach, Rev. des étud. gr., 1899, pp. 53 ff.

§84, 6. It can not be accidental that γίνομαι beside γίγνομαι is the regular form in many dialects and appears at an early period, whereas other examples of ν for γν are only sporadic. Obviously the unreduplicated γεν of ἐγενετο, etc., has played a part.

§91. The assimilation of κτ to ττ is also Boeotian. Cf. δακκύλιος on the Tanagra inscription cited above.

§126. A new example of haplology is furnished by τᾶν νεότα beside ἁ νεότᾱς on a Gortynian inscription published by Halbherr, Am. Journ. of Arch., 1897, p. 192. The explanation of this as for νεότᾱτα, which occurred to the reviewer in reading Halbherr's comments, is also suggested by Brugmann in another place (p. 201, footnote). Whether the genitive νεότᾱς on the same inscription is also an example of haplology is more doubtful. Probably it is heteroclitic.

Gort. τὰ τρίτρα almost certainly means 'a third,' not 'threefold' (Keil's interpretation as ἡμιόλιον, Mitth., 1895, p. 51, is unlikely), and so can not be from *τρίττωτρα.

§145, p. 152. "Es bedeutet das die Entstehung eines prinzipiell neuen Akzents, der das Uebergewicht gewann über den alten Hochton einer seiner Stelle vorausgehenden Silbe, *aber schwächer war als der ihm nachfolgende alte Hochton.*" The last clause, which I have italicized, only perpetuates a misconception involved in III and V of Wheeler's well-known statements. The new accent originated in a secondary accent which arose whenever the original free accent had left more than a certain number of morae unaccented. But when the original accent was already

Digitized by Google

within these limits, a secondary accent had no *raison d'être*, and there is no reason whatever for assuming its existence, 'schwächer' or otherwise. As a matter of fact, Brugmann no longer makes any use of it in explaining accent-shifting within the last three syllables. All such changes must be explained as special processes such as the dactylic shifting, or as due to analogical influences within the several suffix categories.

§§153, 159, 160. Brugmann's classification of compounds is so widely adopted that it would perhaps be unwise to tamper with it. But one can not help feeling that the distinction between Classes II and III is not a vital one. In each language there are certain adverbial prefixes which are not found outside of composition, but which occur separately in other languages, and so are not separated by Brugmann from Class III. Why make a separate class for the two prefixes which are not found separately in any language, especially as one of these, the negative *n̥-*, is after all only the reduced form of the *ne* which does occur separately? Far more important seems the distinction between what is given as subdivision 2) of Class III (adjectives which have sprung from prepositional phrases, e. g. *ὑπερ-άνθρωπος*, Lat. *ab-normis*, etc.) and the other subdivisions of the same class.

§230. One of the most striking examples of levelling between the forms of comparison is seen in Heracl. *πολίστων* (Tab. Her. I 130), which has replaced *πλείστων* under the influence of *πολύς*. This explanation occurred to the writer before noting that it had already been given by Hornolle, Bull. corr. hell., 1891, p. 627. So also Meister, Collitz, 4629, note.

§231. A new example of the Aeolic inflection of the perfect participle and, at the same time, of the older formation without *κ* (cf. Boeot. *ϜεϜῡκονομειόντων* and *ἀποδεδόανθι*) is seen in Boeot. *δεδωῶση* (nom. pl. f.) from the Tanagra inscription already quoted.

§232. For *ἴα* see now J. Schmidt, KZ. 36, 391 f.

§256. "Vgl. *πούς* neben *τρί-πος* (Verf., Ber. d. sächs. G. d. W., 1897, S. 191)." The form *-πος* remained for a time in compounds supported by the influence of adjectives of the second declension (Brugmann, l. c.). But note the further development in Cretan. By contrast with *πώς* and under the influence of neuter *s*-stems, *-πος* came to be felt as a neuter form. Cf. Gortyn. *τὸ καρταῖπος* (passages quoted by Miss Searles, Lexic. Study of Grk. Insc., s. v.). It has even affected a preceding substantive, so that we find once acc. sg. *σῦς καρταῖπος*, though *τὸν σῦν* follows in the same sentence.

§332. To Arc. *ἀδικέντα* add now *κνέναν* and *μνέσθαι* from Lycosura (*Ἐφ. Ἀρχ.*, 1898, p. 249). Note also from the new Elean bronze *δαμοσιοία* like *γνοία*, and *δαμοσιῶμεν* in contrast to *θαρρῆν*; also Gortyn. *δαμιῶμεν* (Am. Journ. of Arch., 1897, p. 206) in contrast to *μωλέν*, *κοσμέν*.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, *July*, 1900. CARL DARLING BUCK.

Digitized by Google

A Sanskrit-English Dictionary, Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages, by Sir MONIER MONIER-WILLIAMS. New edition, greatly enlarged and improved, with the collaboration of Professor E. LEUMANN, Professor C. CAPPELLER, and other scholars. Oxford, At the Clarendon Press, 1899.

The first edition of Monier-Williams' well-known Sanskrit dictionary, published in 1872, had the misfortune of being a book with a little too much of a history. The author had absorbed his predecessors, especially the great lexicon of the Petersburg Academy, rather hastily and uncritically; and one of the authors of the Petersburg Lexicon, Dr. von Böhtlingk, took systematic notice of this defect in the preface of the fourth volume of the shorter (second) edition of the Russo-German work. In truth, Monier-Williams' book was not a very satisfactory publication, although it did sell. Too expensive for a modest hand-book, not final enough for the scholar's source of authority, it hung like Triçaṅku, in mid-air. The author, however, did not lose courage: his first endeavor is here followed up by a decided improvement in every particular. Woe is to him that goes among the lexicographers. Although the work, including preface and introduction, was finished during the lifetime of the author, he did not live to see the very substantial book between its covers: a shyly pathetic postscript by his son, M. F. Monier-Williams, tells the story.

One can not judge a lexicon finally from a hasty survey, but it is a pleasure to say that the present work is one of very great merit. Indeed, the chief fault that must be found with it is that its diffusion will be much retarded by the almost prohibitory price of twenty-one dollars. A Sanskrit professor can not airily recommend the book as a manual to his students, lest he be taken for a humorist; and, after all, one of the uses of a lexicon is that it should be in the hands of students. Not that the book is intrinsically dear: it is a stout quarto volume of nearly 1400 pages in three columns of small print; it contains 180,000 words (60,000 more than the first edition)—it is indeed the only existing, relatively complete Sanskrit lexicon in one volume. Moreover, one must not doubt the wisdom and the generosity of the Delegates of the Oxford University Press—presumably the book is as cheap as is at all possible.

Neither Vedic nor Sanskrit lexicography has as yet come close to that Nirvāṇa when the mind of the professional lexicographer is disturbed only by a thinly trickling stream of addenda. We are as yet far from the period of the aftermath. Colossal numbers of pages of texts and commentaries are still waiting for their first edition; e. g., of Vedic texts, the Kāṭhaka-collection, the Paippalāda version of the Atharva-Veda, and the Sūtras of Hiraṇyakeçin, Bāudhāyana, and Bhāradvāja. Sāyaṇa's recently published

Digitized by Google

commentary to the Atharvan presents a good deal that is new. The present volume contains about 25 pages of addenda. The number of words in the Sanskrit lexicon of the future will be nearer 300,000 than 180,000. No doubt every Sanskrit scholar has his little private list: my own numbers a hundred and odd items. I can not better honor the memory of this life of hard work, devoted so largely to the lexicon, than by offering a selection from my own notes of the more important addenda to the lexicon of the future.

In Māitr. Saṁh. 4. 8. 7 (115. 13) occurs the ἅπ. λεγ. stem *sman* in the dat. and acc. *smane smānam*. Neither Böhtlingk nor Monier-Williams suggests any meaning. The passage reads: *puṣṭapate cakṣuṣe cakṣuḥ smane smānaṁ vāce vācaṁ prāṇāya prāṇaṁ punar dehy asmāi svāhā*. Two parallel formulas explain *smane smānam* as 'self to self': 'O lord of prosperity, restore for him sight to sight, self to self, speech to speech, breath to breath!' In one of the parallels, Āçv. Çr. 6. 9. 3, we have *tmane tmānaṁ*; in the other, Āpast. Çr. 14. 21. 7, *ātmana ātmānam*. In AJPh. XVI 421 I explained the defective stem *tman* as due to assimilation to the stem *tanū* in the sense of 'self': the stem *sman*, unless it be a pure blunder for *tman*, is again further assimilated to another stem for 'self'—namely, *sva*.

Pischel, Ved. Stud. I 84, cites Yāska 6. 24: *ā tvā viçantv indava ā galdā dhamaṇīnām*, emending and interpreting the passage without knowing its source and connection. The passage is taken from Mān. Çrāut. 1. 7. 2. 18; the stanza in full is: *ā mā viçantv indava, ā galdā dhamanīnāṁ, rasena me rasaṁ pṛṇa*. The stanza occurs also Āpast. Çr. 8. 7. 10 with two new words (wanting in the lexicons) in the second pāda: *ā galgā dhavanīnāṁ*. Pischel's emendation of *ā galdā* to *āgaldā* is more than problematic.

The word *ávakṣāmam*, AV. 6. 37. 3, adverb, meaning 'down upon the ground,' is wanting. Cf. AV. 11. 10. 23[4], and see SBE. XLII, pp. 93 and 476.

In TS. 4. 3. 12. 3 occurs the expression *kṣuro bhṛjvān* 'a razor with the strop.' The word *bhṛjvān* = *bhurijvān* is wanting. See AJPh. XVII 417.

The word *āñghāri*, a name for one of the celestial guardians of the soma (e. g. VS. 5. 32), appears Çāṅkh. Çr. 6. 12. 20 in the form *aṅhāri*. Wanting in all lexicons.

In Māitr. Up. 6. 22 the word *bheka-viḥkṛndhikā* 'croak of a frog' is left unaccounted for in the lexicons.

All lexicons ignore the list of witchcraft plants (*ghora*, or *āñgirasa*), catalogued Vāit. Çr. 5. 10 as *kapurviparvā, rodākā, vṛkkāvatī, nāḍā*, and *nirdahantī*. The division of the words is not quite secure: *kapurviparvā* may contain two plants; see Critical Notes, p. 63, of Garbe's edition. For the theme see JAOS. XI 387; SBE. XLII, p. xviii ff.; and Bloomfield, The Atharvaveda (Encyclopedia of Indo-Aryan Research), p. 8.

Digitized by Google

The word *kranda*, AV. 11. 4. 2, occurring in company with *stanayitnu* 'thunder,' *vidyut* 'lightning,' and *varṣa* 'rain,' designates 'wind' as the 'roarer'; see ZDMG. XLVIII 570, note 2; SBE. XLVIII 623.

In Kāuç. 38. 3 *kiṣkuru* 'staff, club' (schol. *lakuṭa* = *laguḍa*), wanting in the lexicons, is to be placed by the side of *kiṣku*, with the same meaning, Pañc. Br. 6. 5. 12.

The word *brahmagraha*, some kind of 'possession by demons,' reported on the authority of native lexicographers, may now be quoted from Sāyaṇa's introduction to AV. 2. 9, and Keçava to Kāuç. 27. 5.

The bahuvrīhi-compound *çukrâpṛṣṭha*, AV. 13. 1. 33, translated in the lexicons by 'having a bright back,' means 'carrying soma upon his back'; see SBE. XLII, pp. 211, 667.

Sāyaṇa to AV. 8. 5. 15, speaking of hostile sacrifices designed for the destruction of enemies, picks out a particular one named *çyeneṣu* 'eagle's arrow,' to wit: *yas tvāṁ hiṅsāsādhanāiḥ çyeneṣv-ādiyāgāir jighāṅsati taṁ pumāṅsaṁ jahi.*

The verb *tinī-karomi* in the sense of 'destroy' (schol. *tinīkṛtaḥ tanūkṛtaḥ*) occurs SV. Mantrabrāhmaṇa 2. 7. 1.

The same text, 2. 7. 4, has the bahuvrīhi-adjective *sāçātikāḥ* in connection with *krimayaḥ* 'worms accompanied with *āçātikās*.' The schol. analyzes: *āçatikayā saha.* But the word occurs twice with initial long *ā*: TA. 1. 8. 7 and 4. 36. 1. At any rate, it is a designation of some kind of worms in the body.

The verb *ati+marj* 'wipe off upon,' Māitr. Saṁh. 4. 1. 9 (p. 12, l. 8), is wanting in the Pet. Lexs. and Monier-Williams

The practice which is known Çāṅkh. Gṛh. as *garbharakṣaṇa* 'protection of the foetus' corresponds in the parallel passage Āçv. Gṛh. 1. 13. 1 to *anavalobhana* 'rite for preventing the extinction of the foetus.' The last-named word is imperfectly construed by the translators, for the meaning of its root *lubh* = *lup* = *yup*; see AJPh. XII 422. Another name for the same ceremony, *garbha-dṛṅhaṇa*, Kāuç. 35. 12, is wanting in the lexicons.

The word *apāna*, literally 'out-breathing,' as a euphemism for *anus* or *rectum* occurs as early as Dārila to Kāuç. 25. 9.

Sāyaṇa in the introduction to AV. 1. 2 (p. 15, last line) has the compound *carma-khalvā-mukha*, which corresponds to *carma-dṛti-mukha* in the same author's introduction to AV. 2. 3 (p. 205, middle). The words seem to mean 'opening of a water-skin': the lexicons are silent on the subject.

Sāyaṇa glosses *anusphuram*, AV. 1. 2. 3, by *pratisphuraṇam*, otherwise unquoted; see p. 21, middle.

Popular etymology has created *upadīpikā* (Mahīdhara to VS. 11. 74) and *uddīpikā* (Ath. Pariç. 67. 2) out of *upajihvikā*, *upajīkā*, *upadikā* 'a kind of ant'; see AJPh. VII 483; Kāuç., Introd., p. xliii. For Pāli forms of these words see London Academy, Nov. 19, 1892. *upadīpikā* is wanting in the lexicons.

Digitized by Google

Of the talking birds, *çuka* (parrot), *sāri* (thrush), and *kṛça* ('prediger-krähe'), the last, *kṛça*, is defined by Dārila to Kāuç. 10. 2 as *gomeṇaka* 'a black long-tailed bird'; *sāri* (*sārikā*) is defined by Keçava, ibid., as *kaṇṭārikā*. Neither *gomeṇaka* nor *kaṇṭārikā* (as a bird-name) is in the lexicons. The three yellow birds *çuka*, *ropaṇākā*, and *hāridrava* in AV. 1. 22. 4 seem also to talk (Kāuç. 26. 20). Sāyaṇa in his introduction to AV. 1. 22 defines them respectively as *çuka*, *kāṣṭhaçuka*, and *gopītanakā* (cf. Keçava, who has *gopītilakā*). Neither *kāṣṭhaçuka* nor *gopītanakā* (*gopītilakā*) is in the lexicons. Dārila defines *hāridravāḥ* as *ciṭakāḥ* (perhaps = *ciccika*, RV. 10. 146. 2).

The Dhātupāṭha 22. 22 has a root *srā* (*srāyati*, *pāke*) 'cook,' hitherto unquoted. Sāyaṇa to AV. 2. 3. 3 avails himself of it to explain the compound *aruḥ-srāṇa* 'remedy which causes a wound to ripen or heal.' It is well possible that we have here the source of the root *srā* in the Dhātupāṭha. Cf. SBE. XLII, p. 279.

The unquotable *kācamācī* in the sense of 'spirituous liquor' appears in the schol. to Kāuç. 31. 28, and Sāyaṇa to AV. 6. 136 (vol. II, p. 284, bottom), as a plant that yields fruit (*kācamācī-phalam*).

Sāyaṇa at AV. 6. 14. 3 reads *çuçuko* for *çiçuko* of the text. This he defines as a wild animal or bird (*mṛga*). The matter is not quite clear; see SBE. XLII 464. Other readings of Sāyaṇa that may interest the lexicographer are: *gaḍunta* = *galunta*, AV. 6. 83. 3; *viçvadhāyanīḥ* for *viçvadhā yatīḥ*, AV. 6. 85. 3; *glāṣṭhā* for *kāṣṭhā*, AV. 2. 14. 6. For *madhuçībham* = *madhukrīḍam*, as the name of a honey-mixture in Keçava and Sāyaṇa, see SBE. XLII, p. 461. Sāyaṇa in his introd. to AV. 2. 8 has *tilapiñjikā*, as the equivalent of *tilapiñjī* in st. 3 of the hymn; in the introd. to AV. 3. 1 he has *kaṇikikā* 'small grain' in place of Dārila's *kaṇikvikā* and Keçava's *kaṇikā*: all gloss *aṇūn* at Kāuç. 14. 19. For Sāyaṇa's definition of *dhanūs*, AV. 1. 17. 4, as 'canal in the body,' see SBE. XLII 259 ff. For *tirya* see ibid., p. 376.

Colebrooke, Essays, I 319, mentions a rite called *çyena-yāga* which I have shown to have existed in the Atharvan ritual (Kāuç. 43. 3) under both this name as well as *çyenejyā*; see JAOS. XVI 12. Cf. also Sāyaṇa, vol. II, p. 377, note 2.

The present work, as all its predecessors, ignores the well-authenticated word *çakā* in the sense of *makṣikā* 'insect': Sāyaṇa to AV. 3. 14. 4; Mādhava to TS. 5. 5. 12. 1. See SBE. XLII, p. 351 ff.

Two practices named respectively *ṛṣihastaḥ* and *brāhmaṇoktam* are mentioned by Keçava to Kāuç. 58. 4; see also Sāyaṇa in the introductions to AV. 8. 1 and 11. 4.

TB. 3. 7. 13. 1 exhibits the curious adverbial combination *ádham it* in the pāda *anāgaso adham it saṁkṣayema*. The schol. (p. 552) renders it by *anantaram* 'at once.' The Vāit. Sū. 24. 1, quoting from the Pāippalāda, presents the passage in the variant form: *anāgaso yathā sadam it saṁkṣiyema*.

Digitized by Google

The Rig-Vidhāna refers to certain performances as *āçraya-* (*-karma*). This may be the same as the *ucchraya-karmāṇi*, Keçava to Kāuç. 1. 1. Neither combination is treated in the lexicons.

Finally, a few words from the scholiasts: *abhibhavitar* = *abhibhuḥ* 'mighty,' Sāyaṇa to AV. 6. 97. 1; *itihāsayati* 'to narrate a legend,' Ṣaḍguruçiṣya 10. 47; *ekatrīkaraṇa* 'rendering united,' Agnisvāmin to Lāṭy. Çr. 2. 11. 3; *ekāntarita* 'interrupted by one,' Keçava to Kāuç. 26. 25; *prakhyāpaka* 'meaning,' Mādhava to TB. 2. 5. 6 (p. 628, bottom).

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD.

Greek Melic Poets. By HERBERT WEIR SMYTH (Ph. D. Göttingen), Professor of Greek at Bryn Mawr College, Pennsylvania. London, Macmillan & Co., 1900. cxlii+ 564 pp.

A good annotated edition of the Greek melic poets for English readers, embodying all the best results of recent work in the field, has long been a desideratum, a fact which the discovery of the MS of Bacchylides has made only the more prominent. In the book before us Professor Smyth has aimed to supply this want, and it is a pleasure to record that the work has been admirably done. On every page the author has shown us that he has not only a thorough knowledge of the dialects, but also an extensive and an appreciative acquaintance with the literature. The anthology here given includes all that is best in Greek melic poetry, so much of which at best is but fragmentary, thus rendering the work of the editor all the more difficult. The student who has hitherto looked to Bergk and Hiller for his text, and to Buchholz and Stoll for what little commentary he could get, now finds at home a reliable edition of the text, including all that is of human interest in the Teubner collection, while these generous selections, with the abundant, helpful and stimulating notes which accompany them, make the material offered by Buchholz and Stoll seem but scant by comparison. Pindar was not included, except in the case of the more interesting of the fragments, the epinician odes being already represented by excellent annotated editions; but of the recently discovered text of Bacchylides all that is not too badly mutilated is here, ten odes in all. There is also a collection of skolia and of folk-songs, and the poem of Sappho addressed to her brother Charaxos, urging him to come home from Egypt, is not forgotten. Finally, in an appendix are given the skolia attributed to the sages, a liberal selection from the Anacreonteia, and, at the end, the music (in modern notation) of the hymns to Apollo, discovered a few years ago by the French scholars at Delphi. The list of poets includes thirty-five names, or,

Digitized by Google

with the skolia attributed to the sages given in the appendix, forty-one, and in making the selections from these there was evidently no desire to save space or labor. Prefixed to the text is an introduction giving a very full account of melic poetry in general, and of the different kinds of song in particular, following the order of the chrestomathy of Proklos. There is valuable material in the 142 pages of this introduction, and it is sure to give the student a more distinct conception of the things treated than if he relied on the histories of Greek literature, and certainly a larger conception than if he relied on some of them. It was naturally beyond the scope of such a work to give an account of Greek music, intimately connected though it be with Greek melic poetry. Our knowledge in this field, the 'verrufenste und vermiedenste Winkel unserer Wissenschaft,' as Crusius puts it, is at best but meagre. Dr. Smyth has given enough to urge the student to further study, and certainly enough to give him an abiding appreciation of the fact that Greek melic poetry was written to be sung.

In editing the text, which is in every way representative of the best work that has been done up to the present, Professor Smyth, while only occasionally giving a reading of his own, has evidently been entirely independent in his attempts to get at the truth so far as it may be known. If there is any criticism to be made here it can deal only with minor matters, where there is abundant room for difference of opinion. Such, e. g., is the accurate marking in all cases of lacunae which occur in the MSS. This has been done only where they are large or where the reading is open to doubt. At least, so the author states for Alkman IV and for the epinician odes of Bacchylides, but it would seem that the same guiding principle has been kept in mind everywhere. For the sake of consistency and the resulting feeling of certainty it might be well to mark all cases alike. Again, in printing fragments made up of parts which for good reasons are believed to have been associated, but are not so recorded in our sources, this fact might in all cases have been indicated in the text. It has been done in Anakreon XII and XXIV, but in Sappho XXI the third line is printed as an integral part of the selection, the notes merely stating that it is not found on the same page of Hephaistion as the other two, leaving a doubt as to whether that authority records a connection between the two quotations or not. The indication might seem all the more important, as not all editors are agreed to consider the third line as belonging to the other two.

But it is in turning to the notes that the average reader will probably find himself most richly rewarded. These are largely literary, and they shed a profusion of light everywhere; even the smaller fragments are in this way illumined by references and quotations preceded by a word or two of explanation, which make the whole passage stand out in bold relief. The introductory statements, too, on each poet studied are very full and can not fail

Digitized by Google

to give the student a better understanding of the selections which follow, as well as to put him in touch with the present point of view.

In matters grammatical the notes are less frequent: the author seems to take for granted that such knowledge is already possessed by the student; but certainly an additional note would at times not have been wasted. Not to speak of the less usual Doric and Aeolic forms, a word like *ὕδει*, Anakreon, V 2, might have been noted; or, in syntax, something might have been said of the use of the optative, Bacch. II 190: *εἴ τις εὖ πράσσοι βροτῶν*. The use of the subj. in an apparently similar case quoted (for other reasons) from Pind. Ol. II 4 would naturally rouse the student's curiosity: the opt. occurs again in skolion XIII without note.

In view of the usual fullness of the commentary one regrets, though only occasionally, to observe a departure from the rule. In Bacch. II 107 a reference to the division of the word Καλυδῶν—ν' might have brought out the fact that in the division of lines the MS was followed closely.

Bacch. II 112 the comment on *ἐνδυκέως* merely states 'not of friendly action as in Homer.' Hes. Scut. Her. 427:

> *ὅστε μάλ' ἐνδυκέως ῥινὸν κρατεροῖς ὀνύχεσσι*
> *σχίσσας ὅττι τάχιστα μελίφρονα θυμὸν ἀπηύρα,*

might have been cited in illustration (or even Hom. Od. XIV 109, as showing that the word is not always used of friendly action in Homer).

In a comment on the schema Pindaricum (Pind. IV 18), the statement is made that Gildersleeve says that the singular is the general, the plural the particular; a fuller quotation would have brought out the sense intended rather better, the words used being (Gildersleeve, Pind. Pyth. IV 57): 'this syntactical figure gives no trouble when plural nouns are mixed with singulars or neuters: nor much when the verb precedes, for the singular is the general and the plural the particular.'

In the comment on the Spartan choral (folk-songs XIII), beginning *ἁμές ποκ' ἦμες ἅλικιοι νεανίαι*, one misses a reference to the famous line of Anakreon: *πάλαι ποτ' ἦσαν ἅλικιοι Μιλήσιοι*; it might have by comparison brought out more strongly the use of the iambic trimeter in choral poetry.

There is much that is interesting in these notes in the record of changes, more or less recent, brought about in beliefs long time adhered to; all reminding us, as do changes and additions in the text itself, that the doctrine of Herakleitos holds good for the study of Greek no less than it does for everything else. Such changes we meet, e. g., in the views concerning the relation of Alkaios and Sappho; the existence of the schema Ibyceum, and in a certain sense of the schema Pindaricum; the notion that Stesichoros was the founder of the tripartite arrangement of the chorus, Arion of the *τραγικὸς τρόπος*, etc. The last-named are only

Digitized by Google

samples of the tendency of the Greeks to connect a phenomenon with some great name regardless of certainty, if only there was some show of probability. In the case of the famous lines attributed to Alkaios (XII): *λόπλοκ' ἄγνα μελλιχόμειδε Σάπφοι*, Dr. Smyth has not had the courage of what seems to be his own conviction, for he has printed them under that poet's name, although he has separated them from the other line with which Bergk thought they should be taken.

To omit all reference to the helps given in the study of the metres of the selections would be doing a manifest injustice to a useful part of the work. At the head of each selection is printed a correct scheme of the metre, and all cases of synizesis are clearly marked in the text, thus facilitating and making enjoyable the work of acquiring the rhythm, which is only the shadow of the music, to be sure, but presents at least the outlines of the reality. Twice the printer has been guilty of measuring out less to a line than is its due (Sappho, XXIII and Melanippides, III 3), but there the addition is readily made.

For the use of undergraduate students the work can hardly have been intended, though perhaps those who are more advanced might use it with profit. The author has throughout taken for granted that the reader has a good acquaintance with the dialects—not always a safe inference in the case of a student who has read a little Homer and a play or two. But even for those who have already passed beyond their college course a little more help might have been given at times, so, e. g., a note might have stated the reason why *πάντων* is written Terpander, I 2, while the Doric form is given Alkman, IV 3, XXV 2; or a note might have been given on *παίσαν*, Alkaios, XXXIII, certainly a better reading than *πασᾶν*, but perhaps a little more perplexing to the beginner; on *ἄγναις*, Alkaios, I 2 (although, to be sure, the ending is explained later in XVI 3); on *φιλᾶν*, Simonides, VII 3; a fuller statement on *αὐτεῖ*, Alkman, IV 79; why *πράξας*, Simonides, II 7, was preferred to *πράξαις* of other editors, etc.

That there should occasionally be typographical errors in a work of this kind is only natural: most of them—and there are not many—are self-evident; only in a few instances will they be likely to give rise to misapprehension on the part of the student, as, e. g., when the commentary on *βρότεοι*, Simonides, XXII 5, says 'absence of motion in adj. in *-εος* occurs here, etc.,' or when Sappho, I 14 *μει διάσαισ'* is printed. The variant *δεῖξε* in the note on Alkman, XIV 1 for *ἔδειξε* of the text is not so readily chargeable to the typesetter. The spelling *Rhadamanthos* in the note on Simonides, II 7 is probably due to transliteration at second hand from the Latin: the Greek form would be better. But, then, others have been guilty of this inaccuracy.

Altogether it is a valuable piece of work that we have in this book. Some of its excellencies have been indicated above; to point them out in detail would mean to begin at the Introduction

Digitized by Google

and to go on through to the end, for they are found on every page. One's only regret on laying down the book is that the author has not yet given us, along the same lines, an edition of the elegiac, iambic and epigrammatic poetry of the classic period. And this feeling is due not so much to a conservative desire to keep up old traditions, but rather because there is still a real need for such a work, and because we know that Dr. Smyth would do it well. Perhaps the time is not far distant when even this regret will no longer be felt.

EDWARD H. SPIEKER.

Plutarque. De la musique (Περὶ Μουσικῆς). Édition critique et explicative par HENRI WEIL, Membre de l'Institut, et TH. REINACH, Docteur ès Lettres. Paris, Ernest Leroux, Éditeur. 1900.

The bibliography of ancient music has received a very important accession in the recently published edition of Plutarch's dialogue De Musica by MM. Henri Weil and Théodore Reinach. This treatise, in spite of the date of its composition, whether it be really the work of Plutarch or not, is of extreme value for the history and nature of Greek music during the classical and pre-classical periods. Not only is it on many points the sole source of our knowledge (real or supposed), but it is largely made up of extracts from the works of authors of the fourth century, such as Aristoxenus and Heraclides Ponticus. Its claims to consideration as a literary work are but slight, although the material is thrown into the form of a symposium. The host of the occasion, Onesicrates, proposes in a few introductory remarks the subject of the conference—to wit, music. Two guests, Lysias and Soterichus, take in turn the rôle of expounder of sundry historical, aesthetic and scientific data, which are apparently the contents of a note-book, culled for the most part, not improbably wholly, from writers of some four centuries earlier date. How far this borrowing went is shown by M. Reinach in the Introduction. Although the names of the authors and the extent of the extracts are only occasionally indicated by the writer of the De Musica, it is yet possible in most cases to determine these points with considerable confidence in the results. Aristoxenus is laid under heavy contributions. According to a rough estimate more than one-half of the whole treatise seems to be attributable to him directly or indirectly. Another large portion is based on a work of Heraclides Ponticus (entitled, according to M. Reinach, *συναγωγὴ τῶν <εὐδοκιμησάντων> ἐν μουσικῇ*), which itself drew from fifth-century sources, the Chronicle of Sicyon and the *περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων ποιητῶν τε καὶ μουσικῶν* by Glaucus of Rhegium. This material,

Digitized by Google

besides being collected from various places, is clumsily put together. It would seem that many of the passages are literal quotations. But the very naïveté with which references to the conditions prevailing at the time when the original was composed are left in our treatise, as if they still held good for Plutarch's time, is an assurance of the (unintentional) faithfulness of the transcribing process. With due allowance for the manner of the tradition, we can therefore regard the data here afforded us as if they proceeded directly from the original writers. M. Reinach, who is the author of the Introduction and Critical and Explanatory Notes, has carefully gone over the evidence and has made, where possible, the attribution of each section to its proper author. In this matter he has gone further than Westphal, who edited the treatise in 1865.

Closely connected with the recognition of the author's indebtedness is the question of authenticity. M. Reinach, like Westphal, follows the traditional view and accepts as valid the evidence of the manuscripts, all of which assign the work to Plutarch. On this point he devotes half a dozen pages of the Introduction to a refutation of the opinions of G. Benseler, Volkmann, Fuhr, and B. Weissenberger, who find internal evidence in the style against Plutarch's authorship. But when the necessary deductions have been made, the work of the author's own hand does not cover many pages. There is not, then, much scope for the application of stylistic tests. Arguments based on the language of the extracts are necessarily of little value in determining the authorship of the work as a whole.

As to the naïveté with which the borrowed material is used, it is, in the belief of M. Reinach, an indication that the De Musica was a work of Plutarch's youth. Support for this view is found in the use of the expression *ὁ ἐμὸς διδάσκαλος*, referring to the host, Onesicrates, at whose table the dialogue takes place. It is held that Onesicrates was in fact Plutarch's teacher at Chaeronea, that he is called such in the early work, De Musica, but that after Plutarch's return from Alexandria, where he had heard men of far greater learning than Onesicrates, this form of address is dropped. Consequently in the Quaestiones convivales, where Onesicrates appears again, he is called simply *Ὀνησικράτης ὁ ἰατρός*.

In appearance the new edition leaves little to be desired. The Introduction of 38 pages is followed by appendices giving full accounts of the manuscripts and editions that concern the treatise, and by a complete collection of all the musical passages to be found elsewhere in Plutarch. The Greek text, with the critical notes, is printed on the even-numbered pages only, and is faced by the translation in French. The explanatory notes, which are very copious, occupy the lower halves of the pages. The pages of the vulgate, the Wechel edition, with their lettered subdivisions, are given in the margin, but it has been thought expedient to divide the whole work into 448 small paragraphs (rarely

Digitized by Google

exceeding five lines in extent). Ordinarily a new manner of citation is not welcome, but in consideration of the transpositions which were necessary for the new constitution of the text, it is evident that much was to be gained in facility of reference if, in handling the material, small units could be used. It is to be hoped that the new paragraphs will be adopted in future citations from this treatise.

C. W. L. JOHNSON.

Digitized by Google

REPORTS.

THE JOURNAL OF GERMANIC PHILOLOGY, edited by GUSTAF E. KARSTEN. Vol. II.

Pp. 1–7. James Taft Hatfield (Evanston, Ill.) discusses Uhland's Earliest Ballad and Its Source. In a note-book containing some of Uhland's earlier poetic attempts is to be found his first ballad, Das Lied vom armen Vater. Ein Harfnerlied aus einem unvollendeten Gedichte, a poem of little poetic value, yet of interest in that it makes clear certain steps in Uhland's poetic development. It is the first step towards ballad-writing and away from his earlier, cruder 'moralizing school poetry.' The source is Das Schloss in Oesterreich, which appeared in the first volume of the magazine Deutsches Museum (1776). Uhland was acquainted with this magazine, and by it his interest in older German literature was aroused. The situation and the verbal coincidences in the two ballads are so similar that there can be no doubt about the connection between them. The author also traces a number of phrases in Uhland's later poems to this old German ballad.

Pp. 7–14. G. L. Kittredge (Harvard University), in Notes on Elizabethan Plays, points out two old and hitherto unnoticed occurrences of the proverb 'While the grass is growing.' One is in Reliquiae Antiquae, I 208, and the second, much earlier, in a letter printed in the Epistolae of Petrus de Vineus, lib. II, cap. 53, and by Huillard-Bréholles, Hist. Diplomat. Friderici II, 6, 128. (2) Kittredge proves by parallel passages that Thomas Preston, author of Cambyses, may have been the author of Sir Clyomon and Sir Clamydes, usually ascribed to other authors. (3) The source of the plot of Sir Gyles Goosecappe (in Bullen, Old Plays, 3, 1 ff.) is shown by examination of its plot and a number of parallel passages to be Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde. The latter has undoubtedly influenced the dialogue of the play. (4) The source of the plot of Heywood's The Captives; or the Lost Recovered the author finds in a well-known Old French *fabliau* of Le Prêtre qu'on porte, already represented in English by the Mery Jest of Dan Hew of Leicester (Hazlitt, Early Popular Poetry, 3, 130 ff.).

Pp. 14–28. J. W. Broatch (Yale University), in the article The Indebtedness of Chaucer's Troilus to Benoît's Roman, investigates the question as to whether Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde owes more to Guido da Colonna after Boccaccio's Filostrato or to Benoît de Sainte More's Roman de Troie. The passages, seven-

Digitized by Google

teen in all, cited by Skeat to prove that Guido was a 'direct, though secondary source for the Troilus' are examined in detail, with the result that none of them, according to Broatch, proves the claim of Skeat, and 'some even go far absolutely to disprove it.' Chaucer knew Guido and used him, but not in Troilus and Criseyde. Three passages cited by Herzberg, occurring in Benoît, though not in Guido, and six others of a similar character are adduced, all of which go to show that Chaucer must 'have had Benoît before him when composing the tale of Troilus.' 'A more extended and spiritual treatment of the same theme would show more decisively' that Chaucer followed Benoît rather than Guido.

Pp. 29–31. Otto B. Schlutter (Hartford, Conn.) reprints side by side, for the sake of comparison, Aldhelm's Runic Alphabet, and a Runic alphabet in the Codex Regius, 338, fol. 90.

Pp. 31–3. Otto B. Schlutter, in an article On Old English Glosses, contributes some new conjectures regarding readings in Old English glosses.

Pp. 33–100. Paul O. Kern (The University of Chicago), in Das Starke Verb bei Grimmelshausen: Ein Beitrag zur Grammatik des Frühneuhochdeutschen, presents the tabulated results of an elaborate investigation of the strong verb in the printed works of Grimmelshausen.

Pp. 100–2. George Hempl (University of Michigan), on Der See und die See, notes that 'the distinction in the meaning of the word according as it is masculine or feminine is comparatively recent,' and arose in literary language. The word was originally masculine, but the northern Germanic tribes developed the feminine instead. As their use generally referred to 'sea,' the feminine gender prevailed for this meaning. In Southern Germany, however, the masculine gender survived as applied to the only large body of water existing in the interior, that is 'lake.' 'Later the grammarians formulated the distinction,' though the Southern Germans occasionally use the masculine for 'sea' and the Northern Germans *die See* for 'lake.'

P. 102. George Hempl contributes a short note on Middle English *wǭ* : *wō*, as a Middle English rhyme-test, a subject discussed by him in J. G. Ph. I 23 f.

No. 2.

Pp. 149–99. Charles H. Whitman (Yale University), in The Birds of Old English Literature, gives a list of over one hundred and forty bird-names mentioned in Old English literature and glosses, and makes out sixty-seven species which were then residents of Great Britain. The author has classified them into: I. Indigenous Wild Species; II. Domestic Fowl; III. General Terms, Foreign Species, etc.; and has followed each species through O.E. literature, citing the glosses or works in which the

Digitized by Google

names occur. An Old English, a Latin, and a Modern English index makes the collection a very practical one and of value to students interested.

Pp. 199–203. H. S. Napier (Oxford University, England), A Fragment of the Ancren Riwle, reprints a single leaf, containing sixty-four lines (date 1330–40), of the Middle English Ancren Riwle, the dialect of which points to the southwestern part of England. The leaf is the fragment of an old binding, cut on one edge and quite illegible on the second page. The original has been restored with the help of Morton's edition.

Pp. 203–13. Jefferson B. Fletcher (Harvard University), Huon of Burdeux and the Fairie Queene. The article, which is the first to trace in any detail the influence of the French romance (translated about 1525 by Lord Berners under the title of The Boke of Duke Huon of Burdeux) upon Spenser's Fairy Queen, limits itself to a comparison of the first book of Spenser's poem with the original French *chanson de geste*. The comparison, arranged in parallel columns, takes up only the plot of the two works compared, leaving detailed comparison for later publication, when the author promises to prove verbal similarities. The author concludes: "Unless I am mistaken, then, Spenser drew from Huon of Burdeux the chief outlines and characters of his romantic fairy world, . . . and in the first book of his poem follows step by step the dramatic presentation of the same motive as developed in the original *chanson de geste* of Sir Huon."

Pp. 213–34. Francis A. Wood (Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Iowa) contributes notes on the Etymologies of some thirty Germanic words and related forms in other languages, tracing them to original simple roots, according to the principles laid down by him in J. G. Ph. I 280 f.

Pp. 234–9. George Hempl (University of Michigan), on Skækja, Karl, Kerl, Kegel, etc., adds some further information and corrections to an article on the same subject by him in J. G. Ph. I 342 f., which bear out the original claims as to the connection of the words.

No. 3.

Pp. 283–323. Philip S. Allen (University of Chicago), on Wilhelm Müller and the German Volkslied, the first of a series of articles on Müller. After giving a list of Müller's poems, upon which the article is based, and the rather scanty bibliography concerning Müller, the author shows why Müller, whose poems, set to music by Schubert and others, are more commonly sung than read, is so widely known among the Germans. The reasons of this popularity are because, in the first place, he is a poet of wine, a poet of freedom, the *vagorum archipoeta* who appeals particularly strongly to the Germans with their migratory

Digitized by Google

instincts. Then, because of the kinship of Müller's poems with the older Volkslieder and of the development by Müller of 'poetical form as a vehicle of dramatic expression along lines already laid down by Goethe and Uhland.' Finally, his popularity is due 'to the simple individuality of the poet himself.' The present paper tries to establish the thesis that 'an evident kinship exists between the older Volkslieder and the lyrics of Müller,' taking the Des Knaben Wunderhorn as a 'convenient standard by which to determine this kinship.' A Volkslied the author defines as 'a song from whatever source, of whatever form, sung for a long time by all kinds and conditions of people . . . The time of composition, the author, the form are means of classifying, but the real arbiter after all is *vox populi*.' Popularity during two generations establishes the claim of a song to being a Volkslied. The time for making Volkslieder has not gone by, as the author shows by citations. Allen traces the development and growth of the appreciation of popular poetry, especially in Germany, where the Romantic School kept alive the interest in the Volkslied, though the poems of its earliest members failed to catch its spirit. The Wunderhorn, though not the first collection of Volkslieder, was the first to present a great mass of them, notwithstanding its careless compilation and its large number of spurious ballads. This publication influenced immediately both the language and the form of poetry, and made the propaganda of the Volkslied one of the tenets of the Romantic School. In the opening decades of the century 'a great store of Volkslieder was the stock-in-trade of the average lyricist,' and all the greater poets became conscious imitators.

Müller never departed from the style of the Volkslied, not only in his best known ballads and songs, but not even in his religious verses nor in his verses on foreign models and Greek songs. Müller's life and environment explain this love for the folksong in all its various phases. He 'scarcely wrote a line from first to last which did not betray the influence of the Volkslied.' His short life explains the unity of Müller's work. His poetry lacks the pessimism due to disappointing experience, as it also lacks the caution of maturity. Allen protests against grouping together Müller and Eichendorff and making him the 'creature of Goethe, Uhland or Eichendorff.' To the Wunderhorn must be attributed the paramount influence upon Müller, though 'he was not bounded by the Volkslied, but made the Volkslied as wide as his own horizon. Although the emotions depicted in his poems were not real emotions, still their unreality does not exclude them from being a modern Volkslied, for sincerity is not necessarily a *sine qua non* of the modern Volkslied.' Müller's songs are widely sung and are therefore Volkslieder, though 'they are as widely different from the ancient Volkslied form as democracy is from the feudal system.' But it is to be remembered that the character of the Volkslieder is continually changing. In a following article

Digitized by Google

the writer proposes to discuss in detail the obligations of Müller to the Volkslied, which will throw a good deal of light upon Müller's position in literature.

Pp. 323–59. Frederic Ives Carpenter (University of Chicago), Thomas Watson's 'Italian Madrigals Englished,' 1590. Watson must be regarded as a minor master of metrical form in his day. He 'was one of the reformers of our versifying in the Italianate and Petrarchan direction.' He attempted to establish the Petrarchan tradition in English poetry by his Hecatompathia or Passionate Centurie of Love in 1582 and by his First Sett of Italian Madrigalls Englished. The latter have never been published as a whole. Though they have very little intrinsic poetic value, still their historic interest is considerable. They are reprinted here from the copy in the British Museum (shelfmark C 130). Half of these madrigals have 'no further connection with their Italian analogues than is supplied by their musical setting in common, unless in some cases the mood or *motif* in the English was suggested from the Italian.' 'Some eight or ten others were apparently suggested in whole or in part from the Italian. Some three or four others may fairly be termed free translations from the Italian words which appear with the original music.' Two madrigals assigned to Byrd may have been written by Watson and set to music by Byrd, or possibly written by Byrd. The choice of so many madrigals from Marenzio, the best of Italian madrigalists, tends to show that Watson possessed a highly cultivated musical taste or was assisted in his selection by some professional musician, possibly Byrd. The sources of the reprinted madrigals are indicated, and the most important references in them are explained. The madrigals follow the strict syllabic system rather than the rhythmical or accentual. The authors of the Italian originals, except in one case, are identified. A brief account of Italian composers is given.

Pp. 359–63. Arthur S. Napier (Oxford, England), On Some Old English Ghost-Words, shows that the Old English forms *toste* 'frog, toad,' and *taxe* 'toad' are one and the same word—namely, *tosca*, *toxa* (or possibly fem. *-sce*); and that *fornefa* (in most Old English dictionaries) ought to be struck out, together with the feminine *fornefe*, as they really stand for two words, *for nefena*. Napier also points out that a fruitful source of confusion in Old English glosses lies in the fact that frequently a word is indicated by only a few letters sufficient to indicate its meaning to the Old English reader. For instance, *lāc* is given as 'medicine': it is, however, an abbreviation of *lacnunge*. A number of ghost-words cited by Napier are the result of a misreading of the manuscripts.

Pp. 363–70. O. F. Emerson (Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O.), The Letters of Edward Gibbon. The new edition of Gibbon's Letters (1896) was heralded as containing a large

Digitized by Google

number of new letters, and it was generally thought by implication to be a complete collection. Emerson supplements the collection by two lists, sixty letters in all, the first containing thirty-six letters by Gibbon, found in his Miscellaneous Works (1796, 1814), which letters 'are by no means lacking in value.' The second list contains letters by Gibbon published in Le Salon de Madame Neckar, a few from The Gentlemen's Magazine, from Notes and Queries, and from Campbell's Lives of the Lord Chancellors. Seven further letters are said to be at Port Eliot. Emerson also gives a list of other interesting letters written to Gibbon, which are omitted in the new edition. While praising the edition for its admirable text, notes and index, still Emerson regrets the omission of the letters cited.

Pp. 370–74. George Hempl (University of Michigan), The Origin of the Runes. 'This paper (read at a meeting of the Modern Language Association in Charlottesville) is intended to give a very brief account of the discovery of the key to the question of the origin of the Runic alphabet.' The complete treatment is promised later. Hempl protested in 1895 against Wimmer's theory of its origin—namely, from the Latin alphabet—and others have protested since; but no other theory has been proposed as a substitute. By changing the order of the runes and then closely examining this order and the form of the runes in detail, Hempl reaches the conclusion that the 'runes are based on a Western Greek alphabet differing but little from the Formetto alphabet and that in the direction of certain Western alphabets, for example, the Venetic, the East Italic (or Sabellic) and the Gallic; and the adoption of this alphabet by the Germanic people took place about 600 B. C., at which time the chief changes that differentiate Germanic speech from the remaining Indo-European languages had taken place.'

No. 4.

Pp. 429–54. Jefferson B. Fletcher, Areopagus and Pleiade. 'The purpose of the paper is to emphasize a certain parallelism between Ronsard's Pleiade and that literary club to which Spenser in his letter to Harvey of October 5, 1579, gives the name of Areopagus. It will not be possible to produce the lines of this parallelism to do it justice . . . I hope at least to show cause why two dominant schools of literature in the second half of the sixteenth century should not be studied apart.' The pronunciamento of the Pleiade issued in 1549 was Du Bellay's La Deffence et Illustration de la Langue francoise. The English Poet of Spenser, the tenets of which can be inferred from 'E. K.'s' reference in the Shepheard's Calender, and which were probably embodied in Sidney's Defense of Poesie, appeared in 1579 as the program of the English school. It has been generally held that there is a relationship between the French and English school,

Digitized by Google

due, however, to a coincidence. Fletcher maintains that it was more than a coincidence; 'it was a conscious following of the French group by the English.' He shows surface analogies between the Pleiade and the Areopagus, a personal friendship between Ronsard, who was generally popular in England, and Sidney, and lays stress upon the envy felt by Queen Elisabeth of 'the lustre which Ronsard in Paris and Tasso at Ferrara were shedding upon their respective sovereigns.' He also calls attention to the peculiar name of the English club, probably suggested by that of the French, and holds that these facts make probable an analogy between the clubs. A broad comparison of the purposes and performance of these literary coteries establishes more surely the probable identity of the clubs. This comparison the writer makes by quotations of similar passages taken from their programs, by tracing out the doctrines promulgated by each club, and by discussing the character of the various poetical products of these doctrines. As there is no third source known for these analogies, there must have been a conscious imitation of the French by the later English club.

Pp. 454–528. John McLaren McBryde, Jr. (Hollins Institute, Va.) presents an elaborate study of Cowley's Davideis. 'The purpose in resurrecting this almost forgotten epic of Cowley's is to show in some slight way the growth of the religious epic prior to Milton and the part which Cowley took in its development.' In the first section of his article the writer gives Cowley's Biography, in the second discusses the familiar letters of Cowley (which appeared in Fraser's Magazine, vols. XIII and XIV), and proves them spurious. The section on the David Theme in Literature preceding Cowley gives a list of extra-scriptural traditions and legends concerning David, and besides a long list of early morality plays, later dramas and poems on the same theme in the literature of England and Europe. McBryde gives hasty sketches of Bishop Bale's God's Promises and Hans Sachs' plays, and analyzes quite at length the works of Guillaume de Saluste du Bartas (d. 1590), a strong Protestant and follower of Henry IV of France, whose principal work is an almost complete history of the Old Testament in verse, and was translated into English as early as 1591. Comparisons between the Davideis and Du Bartas' work demonstrate that Cowley's design and that of the Frenchman were wonderfully alike, and that Cowley owed much to the latter. Other English works on this same theme are analyzed, but no influence, or only a general influence, to these works can be traced. In the section Cowley and Milton, the writer makes clear certain influences of Cowley upon his greater successor. In a few paragraphs poems concerning David subsequent to Cowley are treated rather generally. The detailed comparison between the Davideis and Crashaw's Sospetto D'Herode leads McBryde to the conclusion that 'while the proofs are not conclusive, it seems more probable that Cowley the younger poet . . . should have borrowed from a translation of the popular Marini (provided

Digitized by Google

it was then in MS) rather than that Crashaw with his original before him should have borrowed from Cowley's poem.' In a chapter Cowley and Virgil the writer investigates carefully the relations of the two poets, and finds that to Virgil Cowley owes more than to any one other writer. Both Marini and Cowley are indebted to the Aeneid, 286 f. (the episode of Alecto's visit to Turnus), Cowley having also used Fracastor's Joseph and Fairfax's Tasso. Finally, in a brief discussion Cowley's indebtedness to other classic poets is shown—namely, to Statius, Ovid, Claudian and Hesiod.

Pp. 528–44. Benjamin Ide Wheeler (Cornell University), on The Origin of Grammatical Gender, takes as his point of starting Brugmann's monograph on the Nature and Origin of the Noun-Genders. After reviewing briefly the old theory of noun-gender, as being due to personification and subsequent sexualization, and the theory offered by Brugmann as a substitute—namely, that the distinctive endings originally had nothing at all to do with sex, but acquired the meaning of sex by being applied accidentally to objects having sex, and afterwards becoming productive endings with a distinct meaning of sex—Wheeler urges the following objections to the latter theory. It can not be accepted in place of the old, because it lacks concrete cases to prove it. It furnishes a possible explanation for stems in *-ā*, but none for those in *-ia*, nor for words not belonging to any well-defined suffix-class. 'There is altogether lacking any account of the psychological motive through which words of different ending should have been grouped into a psychologically determined class involving a denotation of sex. The difficulty is increased when we seek for a process by which nouns of different stem, as in *-ā* and *-ī* (*-i̯ā*), should come to recognize each other and unite in a group—a group marked by no grammatical symbol or mechanism, and in no way recognized by the language.' The cases of assimilation noted in living Indo-European languages are all under the guidance of an external symbol or sign, the article, pronoun or adjective. The imperfect rudimentary grouping of word-forms, carrying a like idea or involving any relationship, is created or maintained under the protection and patronage of some compacted category of form. But the author insists: 'The psychological grouping from which the phenomena of analogy result is never a grouping on the basis solely of meaning, nor on the basis solely of form, both are involved in every case.'

On general principles the writer holds it 'improbable that the categories of sex-gender originated from within the nouns themselves, which by their very nature directly indicate the objects for which they stand, and which may not be expected to require for the identification of the object such an indication of sex as is, for example, eminently convenient in words of shifting application like the personal pronouns *he*, *she*, *it*.' Hence he takes up in detail a theory propounded by him in 1889 and amplified by Henning and Jacobi, which maintains that the development of

Digitized by Google

grammatical gender in the noun had been determined by the inflections of the pronoun. The pronoun possesses the opportunities for the development of categories distinguishing sex-gender. Since gender was originally not indicated in verb or noun, its origin naturally ought to be found in the pronoun or adjective. This *a-priori* theory is confirmed by existing facts in non-Indo-Europ. languages with imperfectly developed systems of grammatical gender. English 'presents an almost perfect illustration of dependence upon the pronouns for special mechanism in the indication of sex.' A large number of examples are cited in English which show in every case that 'there is in English no grammatical gender of nouns. The distinctions of real and metaphorical sex belong to the objects and not the names.' Words like *poetess*, *he-goat* are makeshifts, and no exceptions. The same is true of the Greek ἡ θεός, ἡ νῆσος, etc., which can not be explained from the point of view of grammatical gender. 'They are the fragmentary retention of an early type and status existing before the sex-gender inherent in the pronoun had created a concord of the adjective and grafted itself upon those suffixal classifications of the noun which, as a result of the engrafting, have come to exhibit the phenomena of grammatical gender.'

Wheeler, taking as a basis of investigation compound nouns, proposes a new theory for the explanation of the Indo-Europ. neuter nouns in *om*. These nouns he considers as original forms of individualized *o*-nouns representing 'the passive recipient . . . in distinction from the bearer and exponent of the action represented in the *s*-forms.' 'In this character and with this value the two sets of forms (*-s* and *-m*) became crystallized in the paradigms of those nouns which, through loss of the "thematic vowel" (see Streitberg, Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc. XXIV), provided a great part of what are now the masculines and feminines of the third declension.' When the feeling for the nominative case as grammatical subject had been evolved, 'words which by virtue of their value as denoting things had been chiefly used in the *m*-form, so long as the verb was usually the name of an action set forth in an actor with the *s*-form, now began to appear as nominatives and in this *m* form which had meanwhile come to be identified with their substance. In this they were aided by the analogy of the neuters of the first stratum (namely, mass words like *sāld*, which in general formed no plurals), which knew no difference between nom. and acc. forms.' Brugmann's theory of *om*-forms Wheeler rejects entirely. This theory of Wheeler explains why only the *o*-declension has a characteristic neuter ending, why in *all* neuters nom. and acc. agree in form, why the likeness in ending of the neuter nom. and masc. acc. is limited to the *o*-declension. If this theory be accepted, then the most fundamental and oldest classification of Indo-Europ. nouns is 'that of the oldest neuters, represented historically by the third decl. neuters, on the one hand, and the individualized *o*-, *i*-, *u*-stems on the other.' It is a classification analogous to that between definite and indefinite

Digitized by Google

in other languages, 'recognized as representing a first crude impulse, which, through the engrafting of the notion of sex-gender inherent in the pronoun, is capable of yielding the phenomena of grammatical gender.'

'The connection between pronoun and noun was established by means of the adjective,' which 'agrees with the pronoun rather than the noun.' Adjectives were names of shifting application like the pronouns, and like them were aided in their denotation of objects by an indication of sex. The pronoun made use of *she*-forms, one of which, *sa* (Gk. ἡ), is the source of the feminine *a*-ending. Another form, Indo-Europ. *si* (*syā*), may also furnish the clue to the origin of the fem. *i*(*ia*)-suffix.

The *s* of the nominative had nothing to do with gender. The *ā*-form was introduced into the adjectives of the *os*-ending to aid the precision of denotation when an object of female sex was referred to by such a noun-adjective. When once it was possible to modify the adjective, it was an easy step to the nouns. If once 'a group of words had fastened the notion that *-ā* referred to *sā* and femininity, other words in *-a* by virtue of the folk-instinct for like notions in like forms would be constrained into yielding some vaguely-felt folk-etymological connection with the idea of femininity. Undoubtedly in certain cases personification would help the analogy and would aid in bringing form and idea into harmony.' Throughout the history of Indo-Europ. languages gender remained an imperfect blending of two systems of classification. 'At one extreme classification was based on meaning, at the other on form.' Wheeler adds a bibliography of the general subject.

Volume II of the Journal contains the usual number of book-reviews on a considerable range of subjects. Of these, two are especially suggestive and valuable. One by C. von Klenze (University of Chicago), concerning Literature on the Nature-Sense, which contains part of an extended bibliography, with very helpful comments, dealing with the appreciation of nature among the poets and writers of various nations and ages. The other, by J. M. Manly (Chicago University), is a review of Alois Brandl's Quellen des weltlichen Dramas in England vor Shakespeare (Strassburg, 1898), which contains a large amount of new information, besides a carefully detailed criticism of each play, with its notes and readings.

The fourth number of this volume contains a portrait and tribute to the memory of Professor George A. Hench, one of the editors, who met his death in an accident, October 16, 1899. Professor Thomas, an old friend and colleague, gives an account of his life and professional work, and offers a high personal tribute to his character, to which all who have known Professor Hench will heartily subscribe. For all who knew him have truly lost an inspiring example and a sympathetic friend.

YALE UNIVERSITY. GUSTAV GRUENER.

Digitized by Google

PHILOLOGUS, LV (1896).

I, pp. 1–19. O. Crusius: Litteraturgeschichtliche Parerga. III. Kleobuline, Kleobulos, and Aisopos. IV. Alkaios and Anakreon —a defence of the usual chronology against recent attacks of Beloch and others.

II, pp. 20–38. O. Immisch: Zur aristotelischen Poetik. Study of an Arabic translation of the Poetics through the Syriac, Cod. Par. 822 A, saec. XI ineunt.

P. 38. Cr.: Ad Iuliani Epistulam VIII, p. 377, D. He follows Babrias; cf. Ep. 58 (59), p. 444 B.

III, pp. 39–45. J. H. Lipsius: Zu Hyperides Rede gegen Athenogenes. Discussion of legal points.

IV, pp. 46–61. W. Schmid: Kritisches und Exegetisches zu Euripides' Kyklops.

P. 61. W. H. Roscher supplements Philol. LIII 362, concerning the legends of the birth of Pan, that Mythograph. Gr. I, p. 257 shows a contamination of two different genealogies.

V, pp. 62–72. R. Fuchs: Zu den Epidemien I des Hippokrates.

P. 72. C. Haeberlin: Eurip. Helena 1155–1160 D, emends to *ἃ Πριαμίδας γ' ἆσε φιλοπτολέμους.*

VI, pp. 72–122. G. F. Unger: Umfang und Anordnung der Geschichte des Poseidonios. Examination of Suidas' statement that Poseidonios' big work in 52 books continued Polybios' history to the war of the Cyrenians and Ptolemy. 1. The last year of Polybios is found to be late 146–145 B. C. from the universal history, but 140–139 from the Greek. 2. The last year of Pos. is 86 B. C. 3. The arrangement. 4. Dates of the fragments cited, with the number of the book. (Continuation, pp. 245–56: 5. Date of the journey to the ocean is shown to be 70 B. C.)

P. 122. Cr.: Cornelius Gallus auf einer ägyptischen Inschrift. Notice of a trilingual insc. publ. by J. P. Mahaffy in Athenaeum, 1896, No. 3568, p. 352.

VII, pp. 123–53. J. Zahlfleisch: Die Metaphysik des Aristoteles das einheitliche Werk eines Autors. His conclusion (p. 153) is: It is probable, from the lack of references to this work in his other writings, that it was composed by A. towards the end of his life, at a time when he was too much occupied by various business matters to take the pains to preserve even externally, in style and arrangement, the unity of the whole.

P. 153. C. Haeberlin: Herod. VI 19, suggests for the second verse of the oracle: *ἀγλά' ἕλωρα* for *ἀγλαὰ δῶρα.*

Digitized by Google

VIII, pp. 154–9. B. Kübler: Recisamenta critica. Bell. Alex., 2 notes; Bell. Hisp., 11 notes; Caes. Bell. Civ. I 6. 6; Cic. in Cat. I 13. 3 and 17; etc.

IX, pp. 160–69. W. M. Lindsay: Die Handschriften von Nonius Marcellus, I–III, with stemma. Lost archetype of the 7th–8th century, the original of F^3 (if not the arch.) of the first generation; L of the second; (H^2PVE I–II med.) F and the excerpt MSS of the third; while H^1E (II med. III) come from F.

P. 169. M. Krascheninnikoff: Zu den Scholia BP in Germanic., p. 103, Breysig.

X, pp. 170–79. A. Milchhoefer: Athen und Thukydides, II 15, combats Dörpfeld's view (Athen. Mitth. XX, S. 161 ff.) as to the location of Dionysion *ἐν Λίμναις* and the Enneakrunos.

P. 179. E. Ziebarth: Kritische Randnoten aus Handexemplaren Hermann Sauppes. III. Zu Xenophon. Conviv. (10 notes); Agesil. (9).

Miscellen.—1, pp. 180–81. F. Hiller von Gaertringen: Heros *Ἐπιτέγιος* in C. I. A. I 194–225 (429–8 B. C.).

2, pp. 181–5. K. Zacher: Die erhöhte Bühne bei Aristophanes, Vesp. 1514, 1342; Eq. 148 f.; Acharn. 732 are adduced against Dörpfeld's theory.

3, pp. 186–7. C. Haeberlin: Noch einmal Besantinos (v. Philol. 54, p. 310).

4. pp. 187–8. H. Stadler: Ein ungedrucktes Dioskoridesfragment, from a Munich MS mentioned by Marcellus Virgilius in 1518 in his commentary to Diosk. [On p. 382 he corrects statement: it was published in 1478, at Colle in Toscana.]

5, pp. 189–91. P. de Winterfeld: Ad scriptores latinos coniectanea. Auct. de dub. nom., p. 93. 1 (Haupt); Manilius, I 371; Jac. Petron. fr. 37; Calp. Flacc. decl. 49; Apul. anechomen. 12; 18; 20. Alc. Avitus, c. 6. 394.

6, pp. 191–2. O. Rossbach: Der Pithoeanus des Phaedrus. Excerpts, written before Havet's critical edition.

XI, pp. 193–6. R. Reitzenstein: Leukarion bei Hesiod (cf. Philol. 54, 395). Hesiod ap. Etym. Gud. wrote *Λευκαρίωνι*; the oldest tradition as to the descent of the Locrians knew a Leukarion but no Deukalion.

XII, pp. 197–212. W. Heraeus: Sublimen, gives the MS support for such an adverbial form, and accepts Ritschl's etymology from *limen* as possible.

P. 212. Cr.: Babrius, CXXIII 1 und die Collationen des Athous, which has *φὰ χρυσᾶ*.

XIII, pp. 213–44. J. Marquart: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte von Eran (continued from Philol. 54, 489–528). 5. In criticism

Digitized by Google

of Faustos of Byzantium. 6. Hazarapet. 7. The old Persian calendar. 8. Ἀρταῖοι. 9. Erymandus. 10. Haraiwa. Supplementary notes.

XIV, pp. 245–56. Continuation of VI, p. 73, q. v.

XV, pp. 257–76. W. Soltau: Die Entstehung der Annales Maximi. I. The oral utterances of the pontifex were, acc. to Cic. de Or. II 13. 52, towards the end of the fourth century B. C. put on the tabula dealbata, potestas ut esset populo cognoscendi. The accretion of many secular and purely political facts led the pont. max. Q. Mucius Scaevola, ca. 120 B. C., to collect their contents into 80 books. II. The chief element of the Annales, so far as they concern the history of the 4th–5th cent. B. C., was simply the fasti consulares.

XVI, pp. 277–306. A. Baumstark: Die zweite Achilleustrilogie des Aischylos. (*a*) <Λητίδες> with a chorus of 12 captive girls belonging to Achilles, (*b*) Memnon with chorus of 12 daughters of Helios, (*c*) Psychostasia with chorus of 12 Pleiades. This trilogy was presented in 468 B. C., losing to Sophokles.

XVII, pp. 307–17. E. Graf: Zu Aristophanes Fröschen. Critical notes. Holds that the play was enlarged for a second staging.

P. 317. H. Deiter: Cic. Philip. XIV 5. 13 impetus (gen.) crimen inuidiaque quaeretur?

XVIII, pp. 318–40. L. Gurlitt: Handschriftliches und Textkritisches zu Cicero's Epistulae ad M. Brutum. *A.* (*a*) The northern transmission of 'lib. I'; (*b*) of lib. II (really the beginning of lib. IX). *B.* The Italian transmission. *C.* The critical apparatus.

XIX, pp. 341–52. H. Blümner: Textkritisches zu Apuleius' Metamorphosen.

XX, pp. 353–84. O. Crusius: Grenfell's Erotic Fragment und seine litterarische Stellung. Text. The piece is in free and varied rhythms, and may be classed as a lyric mime—hilarodia (Athen. 620–1 B)—of which Simos of Magnesia was the master; to which class, perhaps, the Roman cantica are to be referred.

Miscellen.—7, pp. 384–7. W. M. Lindsay: Der Salamanca Epiktet—the edition of 1555.

8, pp. 387–9. F. Münzer: Der erste Gegner des Spartacus—C. Claudius C. f. Glaber (acc. to a senatus consultum for Oropos), and the other known facts.

9, pp. 389–91. W. Schmid: Zu Terentius, Adelph. 55–6, restores to

> Nam quí mentíri aut fálleré suum erum aút patrém
> Audébit tanto mágis audébit céterós.

Digitized by Google

10, pp. 391–2. Th. Stangl: Zu Cic. de Orat. II 321, *rursus* instead of the *rursum* of the archetype.

XXI, pp. 393–415. B. Heisterbergk: Municeps. 1. Definition of Paulus and Festus; 2. of Aelius Gallus and Isidorus (cf. p. 408). Two distinct kinds: those who settled in Rome and received some part in the civic rights of the Romans, and others who not in Rome but in their own towns were designated *municipes*, because they had filled public office. The inference is that the word *municeps* was twice coined from different causes and in different places; then an attempt was made to reconcile the uses.

XXII, pp. 416–32. H. Düntzer: Eine Reisesatire und eine Reiseepistel des Horatius. Comparison and discussion of Sat. I 5 and Ep. I 15.

P. 432. H. Deiter: Liuius XXII, emends 17. 2 to flammae ex capite *optae*; 46. 5 ante alias, nearer P than Madvig's *alios*; 57. 5 existunt *for* insistunt (Madvig's *exeunt*).

XXIII, pp. 433–6. L. Radermacher: Ein metrisches Gesetz bei Babrios und anderen Iambendichtern. In the case of monosyllables before the penthemimeres of the iambic trimeter, a syllable long by nature regularly follows one long by position.

XXIV, pp. 437–61. B. Maurenbrecher: Tibullstudien. Relation of the MSS; stemma (p. 448); the five branches of the transmission may be seen from the stemma on p. 461.

XXV, pp. 462–73. C. Weymann: Beiträge zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur. 1. Gregorios Thaumaturgos. 2. The Vita Martini of Sulpicius Severus. 3. Petrus Chrysologus. 4. Reading of the classics in the later period (A. D. 413–430).

XXVI, pp. 474–90. T. Baunack: Neue Bruchstücke gortynischer Gesetze. Two new fragments found in 1895 near the great inscription. They do not belong to the great inscription, nor to one single inscription, nor are they by the same hand.

XXVII, pp. 491–540. Th. Zielinski: Excurse zu den Trachinierinnen. 1. The Herakles of the Zeus-religion. 2. Lichas. 3. Herakles' love for Iole is his first and only breach of faith. 4. The present. 5. The love-charm. 6. Iole. (Continued, XXX, pp. 577–633, q. v.)

XXVIII, pp. 541–60. R. Issberner: Dynamis und Themis. The Greeks designated a tone by its thesis; the absolute pitch of a tone, by its dynamis; its independent relative value in its octave, in its scale. There is also given an explanation of the Ptolemaean tabellae and their terminology.

XXIX, pp. 561–5. O. Crusius: Die illustrierten Terenzhandschriften und Tacitus, Dialogus XX. According to Leo

Digitized by Google

and others the ultimate source of these illustrated MSS is the Ἀττικιανὰ ἀπόγραφα. M. Aper in Tac. Dial. 20 says: nec magis perfert in iudiciis ... antiquitatem quam si quis in scaena ... Turpionis Ambiuii exprimere gestus uelit, which Cr. takes to refer to current illustrations.

P. 565. O. Cr.: Der Tanz der Mänaden. Vergil's simile, Aen. VII 373–7, comparing Amata's movements to those of a top, shows that the Bacchantes must have whirled about in a round-dance.

Miscellen.—11, pp. 566–8. E. Holzner: Zu den Fragmenten der griechischen Tragiker.

12, pp. 568–71. C. E. Gleye: Zu Q. Curtius Rufus. Seven passages.

13, pp. 571–3. M. Krascheninnikoff: Epigraphisches. 1. *Fifeltares*?, C. I. L. I 603, he takes to be corrupted from *inspecta re* with a dittographic final *s* from ffg. *sei*. 2. *Sefitius* (*socurtalis*?), C. I. L. IX 4549 = sefitius s. c. curialis, i. e. a corruption of Suffetius, or possibly a vulgar form.

14, pp. 573–5. M. Manitius: Zur lateinischen Sprichwortlitteratur. Additions to Otto from the epistles of Columban, Boniface, *et al.*

15, pp. 575–6. P. Knapp: Zu Eurip. Kyklops, vs. 152.

XXX, pp. 577–633. Th. Zielinski: Excurse zu den Trachinierinnen (continuation of XXVII, pp. 491–540). 7. The oracle. 8. Deianira. 9. The poison. 10. The Herakles of the Trachinae. 11. Time of presentation, on metrical and internal grounds; this is either the oldest of Sophokles' tragedies, or certainly not much later than the Antigone.

XXXI, pp. 634–53. A. v. Premerstein: Ueber den Mythos in Euripides' Helene. Summary on p. 653: Two sources are used; on the groundwork furnished by Stesichorus he has tried, with less success, to build the same action which he presented to the Athenians in his brilliant Iphigenia among the Taurians.

XXXII, pp. 654–88. E. Drerup: Zur Textgeschichte des Isokrates. Accompanying facsimile of Cod. Urbinas gr. 111, saec. X, and Cod. Vatic. gr. 65, anni 1063.

P. 688. R. Fuchs: ὑφηγεῖσθαι. This word can also mean *praedictum esse*, as Theophr. hist plant. 1. 2. 3.

XXXIII, pp. 689–94. K. Kalbfleisch: Zu Galenos.

XXXIV, pp. 695–726. O. E. Schmidt: Die handschriftliche Ueberlieferung der Briefe Cicero's an Atticus.

XXXV, pp. 727–31. G. Schepss: Pseudepigrapha Boethiana.

XXXVI, pp. 732–48. J. L. Herberg: Bibliotheknotizien. 1. MSS of the Gospels in Siena. 2. Greek MSS in Piscenza,

Digitized by Google

Bergamo and Montecassino. 3. Codices Sauiliani. 4. Inventory of the Archivio di S. Pietro. 5. Greek MSS in SS. Giovanni e Paolo and in S. Antonio.

Miscellen.—16, pp. 749–51. H. S. Jones: Zur Geschichte Athens. 1. Archestratos. 2. Drakontides.

17, p. 751. W. Schmid: *Γαειτάνα* in Papyr. Grenfell., No. LIII. Perhaps = 'ass, donkey.'

18, pp. 752–4. L. Mendelssohn: Zum griechischen Lexikon. There are no such words as *ἀφροντίζειν* and *δραχμίον* traditional in our lexicons; but an *εἰκοσαδραχμία*.

Register, etc.

YALE UNIVERSITY. GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG.

Digitized by Google

BRIEF MENTION.

LEGRAND'S *Étude sur Théocrite*, published in 1898 as the seventy-ninth fascicle of the *Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome*, might well have claimed an elaborate review at the time, but the limitations of the Journal as to space and otherwise have excluded the work from prompt consideration; and it is rather late in the day to call attention to a book that has already taken its place in the Theokritean apparatus of the scholarly world. The author calls it modestly a simple work of recapitulation. The *magnum opus* of Susemihl, whom, by the way, M. LEGRAND persistently calls Süsemihl, has been drawn on for the bibliography, but, since the appearance of the *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit*, our repertory has been enriched by the discovery of the Mimes of Herondas, an event of prime importance, and by the emergence of the Erotic Fragment; and a number of special studies have been published which throw new light on the work and art of one who has been called the last of the classics; of whom Andrew Lang has said: "His lyre has all the chords: he is the last of all the perfect voices of Hellas; after him no man saw life with eyes so steady and so mirthful." By gathering up and registering the results of so much special inquiry, M. LEGRAND has rendered a real service, but, despite his modest disclaimer, he has done much more than this. He has not only summarized but analyzed, not only analyzed but criticized, and analysis and criticism are not all; and while he studiously avoids phrase-making, there are passages enough to show personal insight and fresh sympathy. It is not in vain that M. LEGRAND has followed a poet's advice and studied in the poet's own land, and the scholarly reserve of the *ancien membre de l'École française d'Athènes* melts when he recalls the brilliance of the Greek noonday and the rattle of the Greek tettix.

The first chapter deals with the work of Theokritos and questions of authorship. XIX (Κηριοκλέπτης), XX (Βουκολίσκος), XXI (Ἁλιεῖς) and XXIII (Ἐραστής) are rejected—all with scant ceremony except the Ἁλιεῖς, which he considers at greater length, out of deference to Birt's defence, who has seen in the poem the theme of the Ἐλπίδες, a poem attributed by Suidas to Theokritos. But, apart from Brinker's objections to the details of the composition, the philosophizing tendency of the piece is considered by M. LEGRAND as alien to the Theokritean character, and he strikes

Digitized by Google

the Ἁλιεῖς out of the list. Of the bucolic idylls proper he rejects IX entire. Of VIII he admits a few strophes as *débris* of a Theokritean original. XXV (Ἡρακλῆς λεοντοφόνος) is accepted 'after mature consideration,' and XXVII (Θαριστύς), which is cited by no ancient authority and is separated in the MSS from the other mimes, is rejected by LEGRAND, as by the majority of scholars. There are, however, those who will agree with Andrew Lang that the piece is certainly worthy of a place beside the work of Theokritos. The third Aeolic piece, Οἶνος, ὦ φίλε παῖ, λέγεται καὶ ἀλάθεα, is retained, and LEGRAND believed that Theokritos may have amused himself with inditing the Σῦριγξ, as such *carmina figurata* were in the taste of the time, and we are not to look for supreme poetry in such trifles.

The second chapter deals with an examination of the biographical documents, the fixed *point de repère* being Id. XVI (Χάριτες ἢ Ἱέρων), which M. LEGRAND places between the summer of 275 and the early months of 274. Theokritos, a Syracusan, according to prevalent testimony, was one of the first to hail the rising sun of Hieron's glory. Where had he been before? At the court of the Lagidae? Not one of the Ptolemaic poems precedes XVI. On the island of Kos? A seductive theory; but, according to LEGRAND, all the allusions to Kos and things Koan may be referred to a later period of the poet's life. Id. XVI belongs to the young manhood of Theokritos, and the failure of his suit to Hieron resulted in his leaving, say in 273, his ungrateful country, to which he never returned, so that almost all the idylls were written in the East. While engaged in establishing this theory, M. LEGRAND passes in review the relations of Theokritos to Philetas, Asklepiades, Aratos, and others, and then proceeds to discuss in a separate section the supposed allusions to the great quarrel between Kallimachos and Apollonios, which he declines to accept. He does not believe that Theokritos made it his business to better the work of his younger contemporary, and thus show his superiority to the ambitious author of the Argonautica, whom Kallimachos had pilloried as an unclean and rapacious bird.

The third chapter—*L'invention des motifs*—gives a long inventory which it is impossible to summarize, and I must content myself with indicating the characteristic results of the study. Theokritos is not an innovator: he assimilates rather than creates. He does not pose as a savant, an historian, a mythographer. His object is, frankly, to please (*delectare*), not to instruct (*prodesse*). He does attempt to individualize. He deals with the types of his time. His strong side is not ingenuity, not industry. His object is to produce dramatic emotion under the most common forms.

Digitized by Google

So far from aiming at variety, his rustic scenes—those on which his reputation rests—are often very like one another. The world in which he moves is narrow, and the source of the interest which he inspires comes from his variety of expression, and it is with the expression that the fourth chapter deals, with the dialect, the versification, and the style. Here again I must content myself with the author's summary. For an Alexandrian there is in Theokritos a remarkable absence of the caprice of the pedant, the ostentation of the *virtuoso*. There are few rare words, few manufactured words. There is no minute mimicry in vocabulary and dialect. Noteworthy is his independence over against those metrical rules that increase the difficulty without enhancing the charm of the verse. There is no restless striving after novelty in figures and other details of style; no *imitandi cacoethes*. Even the symmetry, which is so striking a feature, corresponds to the actual conditions of the life that furnishes the prototype of the bucolic poems. All this makes Theokritos, for the time in which he lived, a relatively simple author. His weaknesses lie in what M. LEGRAND calls the material elements of expression. His grammar is faulty; his vocabulary lacks the cardinal virtue of *proprietas*; his dialects are a mixture. 'Le style, chez Théocrite,' says M. LEGRAND, 'vaut mieux que la langue'—as if the two could be disengaged.

That every side of this complex subject should be treated with equal mastery was hardly to be expected, and the handling of the syntax is not all that could be desired. To cite but one instance: the exhibition of the article is dependent on an old monograph by Ameis, which dates from the year 1846, before the modern statistical method had been introduced, and whatever the defects of that method may be, it has served to reduce the margin of rash assertion and to bring out masses of suggestive facts. The article in Theokritos is now under Epic, now under Doric influence, and a distinctly different use is to be expected in the different classes of Theokritean poetry, just as Kunst has shown (A. J. P. VIII 116) that the structure of the hexameter in the epic idylls differs from that of the bucolic idylls. To the general principle of variation, M. LEGRAND himself does homage, but personal study of the subject would hardly have omitted the curious illustration that is furnished by Id. XIII (Ὕλας), in which the introductory verses (1–15) addressed to Nikias are replete with articles. When the epyllion begins, the article retreats.

When I began this notice, I thought of making M. LEGRAND'S book the foundation of a little essay, on 'Impression and Analysis,' but that little essay would, after all, have been only another ver-

Digitized by Google

sion of the old sermon that I have been preaching these many years, and I spare the readers of the Journal an unnecessary reinforcement of the doctrine that minute study is not inevitably fatal to the highest enjoyment. What the impressionist critic sees and feels, the analytical critic records by his instruments of precision. The new shudder of which Victor Hugo speaks is no less a new shudder because there is a thermometer to mark the degree of cold. But there is danger in the process, as may be seen when one compares M. LEGRAND'S estimate of Theokritos with that of Andrew Lang, already cited, and it must be confessed that the patient assemblage of details has left the marks of fatigue on the last pages of this valuable monograph. The estimate may be just, but the breath of enthusiasm has spent itself, and one notes a certain autumnal disillusionment.

The completion of the *Dictionnaire général de la langue française du commencement du XVIIe siècle jusqu'à nos jours* (Paris, Delagrave) will be hailed with delight by all scholars. Thirty years of work have found their happy termination, and the thirty-two fascicles have been bound in two volumes and are to be had for the extremely reasonable price of 38 francs. The end of the dictionary proper was reached in the twenty-ninth fascicle, but the close of the twenty-ninth and the subsequent three fascicles have been given up to a treatise on the formation of the French language left unfinished by the death of the lamented Arsène Darmesteter and now completed by M. Léopold Sudre. It is a treatise, but much more than a treatise. It is a general theory of the French language, of which the dictionary is an application and to which constant reference is made in the body of the work. The value and importance of this feature of the dictionary has been recognized by the Académie des sciences morales et politiques, which has adjudged it the Grand Prix Jean Reynaud of 1000 francs.

According to PRELLWITZ in the *Festschrift für L. Friedländer*, ἔτος is 'year,' ἐνιαυτός (from ἔνι αὐτῷ) is 'anniversary.' This view, which met with wide acceptance, was confirmed by the observations of Türk (A. J. P. XVIII 367) and Wilhelm (A. J. P. XIX 228). In vol. CXLII of the *Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Ak. in Wien*, Professor WILHELM has resumed the study of the inscriptional and other evidence. While the two words are interchangeable in a number of phrases—e. g. κατ' ἔτος, κατ' ἐνιαυτόν, δι' ἔτους, δι' ἐνιαυτοῦ—they part company at a certain point. The ISS have ἐφ' ἔτος, καθ' ἔτος in the sense of 'this year,' never ἐπ' ἐνιαυτόν, κατ' ἐνιαυτόν. He is therefore inclined to define ἐνιαυτός as a definite period of time, a calendar year, an official year; but invites further investigation of the interesting problem.

Digitized by Google

The preparation of a good index is always praiseworthy work, and secures for the compiler a permanent place in the apparatus of scholars as well as the thanks of all special students. The *Index in Xenophontis Memorabilia*, for which KATHARINE MARY GLOTH and MARY FRANCIS KELLOGG are responsible, and which forms No. XI of the *Cornell Studies in Classical Philology* (New York, The Macmillan Co.), was prepared under the guidance of Dr. FORMAN, himself the author of an excellent index to Andokides, Deinarchos, and Lykurgos, and his scrutiny is a warrant of good work, so that I am willing to trust it until some one of my contributors finds time for a series of severe tests. Cf. A. J. P. XVII 224–9. To the scholar accustomed to the close observation of phenomena the reading of such an index is full of suggestions (A. J. P. XVI 525); and the comparison of the statistics to be gathered from GLOTH and KELLOGG with JOOST on the Anabasis (A. J. P. XIV 101–6) would furnish food for thought, perhaps fodder for a doctoral dissertation—a consummation devoutly wished by many impatient students. Unfortunately, one of the most interesting of these subjects has been preoccupied. See the literature cited by F. WESTPHAL in his *Praepositionen bei Xenophon*, a Freienwalde Programme of 1888. ἀνά does not occur at all. ἀμφί but once (I 1, 18), in the phrase τοὺς ἀμφί. In the Memorabilia πρός overrides εἰς, a fact doubtless due to the personal sphere of the work, which has to do largely with ethical questions. In striking contrast to Xenophon's general usage, as given by Mommsen, μετά c. gen. occurs in the Memorabilia oftener than σύν with the dative. But SIMON, in his *Xenophon-Studien* (IV 6), allows no weight to this on account of the small number of both μετά and σύν in the Anabasis, whereas he deems it significant that in the 'third part' of the Hellenica σύν gives way to μετά. According to him, the development of Xenophon's style lies in the closer approximation to pure Attic usage. That μετά and σύν together have relatively so little scope in the Memorabilia seems to be due to the sphere or, if one chooses, to the 'Stilgattung.' 'Jedenfalls,' says JOOST, under the head of the final sentence (p. 222), 'ist die Stilgattung nicht ohne Bedeutung; der Sprachgebrauch in den Memorabilien berührt sich mit demjenigen Platos.' But how cautious one must be in manipulating the figures I have shown in the footnote to A. J. P. VIII 221 (note).

The last issue of the Journal was the vacation number, and that may possibly account for the mortifying frequency of *Errata* in the last *Brief Mention*. They are all easily set right, but the Editor finds a certain solace in correcting ὅποι (p. 233, l. 13 from top) into εἴποι and ᾖδομαι (ibid., l. 5 from bottom) into ᾄδομαι.

Digitized by Google

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 812 Broadway, New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Cicero (Marcus Tullius). Letters of Cicero; the whole extant correspondence in chronological order; tr. into English by Evelyn S. Shuckburgh. In 4 v. V. 3: B. C. 48–44. (Bohn's Classical Library.) New York, *Macmillan*, 1900. 27+381 pp. 12mo, cl., net $1.50.

Euripides. The Medea of Euripides; with notes and an introd. by F. D. Allen; rev. ed. by Clifford H. Moore. Boston, *Ginn*, 1900. 27+108 pp. 1 il. 8vo, cl., $1.02.

Mather (Maurice W.) and Wheeler (Arthur L.) Key to the Exercises of 'Latin Prose Writing.' New York, *American Book Co.* [1900]. 2+31 pp. 16mo, cl., 50 cts.

Plato. The Charmides, Laches, and Lysis of Plato; ed. by Barker Newhall. New York, *American Book Co.*, 1900. 29+139 pp. 12mo, cl., $1.25.

Seneca (Lucius Annaeus). Tranquillity of Mind, and Providence: two essays tr. by W. B. Langsdorf. New York, *Putnam*, 1900. 16mo, cl., $1.

Virgil. Aeneid, bks. 7–12; ed., with introd. and notes, by T. E. Page. New York, *Macmillan*, 1900. 24+479 pp. 16mo, cl., net $1.25.

ENGLISH.

Abdu al-Yazdi (Hâji). The Kasîdah (Couplets): Lay of the Higher Law. Translated and annotated by F. B. (Sir Richard F. Burton). London, 1900. 8vo, 42 pp. 21s.

Brown (R.) Researches into the Origin of the Primitive Constellation by the Greeks, Phoenicians and Babylonians. Vol. II. London, 1900. 8vo, 282 pp. 10s. 6d.

The Dhammapada: Moral Verses in Pâli. 2d ed., with literal Latin translation and notes for Pâli students, by V. Fausböll. London, 1900. 8vo, 106 pp. 7s. 6d.

Gale (J. S.) Korean-English Dictionary. Shanghai, 1900. 8vo, 1168 pp. £1 10s.

Murray (J. A. H.) New English Dictionary, on Historical Principles. Vol. IV. Gradely–Greement. Vol. V. Inferable–Inpushing. London, 1900. S. Nr. 1477. 4to. à 2s. 6d.

Myer (J.) Oldest Books in the World. An Account of the Religion, Wisdom, Philosophy, etc., of the Ancient Egyptians. London, 1900. 8vo, 526 pp. £1 10s.

Digitized by Google

FRENCH.

Abeille (L.) Idioma nacional de los Argentinos. Paris, 1900. 8vo. 25 fr.

Blondel (J.-E.) Phonologie historique de la langue française. Paris, 1900. 8vo. 7 fr. 50 c.

Daremberg (Ch.) et Saglio (E.) Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines. Fasc. 28. Paris, 1900. 4to. 5 fr.

Dauzat (A.) Études linguistiques sur la Basse-Auvergne. Morphologie du Patois de Vinzelles. Paris, 1900. 8vo. 10 fr.

De la Grasserie (R.) Études de grammaire comparée. Paris, 1900. 8vo, 444 pp. 20 fr.

GERMAN.

Aeschyli Eumenides. Annotatione critica et commentario exegetico instruxit Fred. H. M. Blaydes. gr. 8. x, 152 S. Halle, *Buchh. des Waisenhauses in Komm.* m. 3.60.

Ahlberg (Axel W.) De proceleusmaticis iamborum trochaeorumque antiquae scaenicae poesis latinae studia metrica et prosodiaca. I, II. gr. 8. vi, 161 u. 30 S. Lund, *H. Möller.* m. 2.60.

Aristeas. Aristeae ad Philocratem epistula (cum ceteris de origine versionis LXX interpretum testimoniis). Ludovici Mendelssohn schedis usus ed. Paul. Wendland. 8. xxxii, 229 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.* m. 4.

Aristophanis equites. Cum prolegomenis et commentariis ed. J. van Leeuwen J. F. gr. 8. xviii, 246 S. Leiden, *A. W. Sijthoff.* m. 6.

Bibliothek, Keilinschriftliche. Sammlung v. assyr. u. babylon. Texten in Umschrift u. Uebersetzg. Hrsg. v. Eberh. Schrader. VI. Bd. 1. Tl. gr. 8. Berlin, *Reuther & Reichard.*—VI 1. Jensen (P.) Assyrisch-babylonische Mythen u. Epen. 1. Hälfte. xxii u. S. 1–320. m. 13.

Breton (R. P. R.) Dictionnaire français-caraibe. Réimprimé par Jul. Platzmann. Edition fac-simile. Leipzig, 1900. 12mo, 415 S. m. 20.

Craig (J. A.) Astrological-astronomical Texts. Copied from original tablets in British Museum and autographed. Leipzig, 1900. 4to, 10 pp. With 95 plates. £1 10s.

Furtwängler (Adf.) Die antiken Gemmen. 3 Bde. Leipzig, 1900. 4to. m. 250.—Inhalt: 1. 67 Taf. in Heliograv. xvi S. Text.—2. Beschreibung und Erklärung der Tafeln. v, 330 S. 3. Geschichte der Steinschneidekunst im klassischen Altertum. xiii, 464 S. Mit 3 Taf. u. Abbildgn.

Gay du Borgeal (H.) Colloquia in usum scholarum. Pars 1. 8. v, 62 S. Genève. Berlin, *Amelang in Komm.* m. 1.75.

Hirsch (J.) Fragment e. arabischen Pentateuch-Uebersetzung. Hrsg. u. eingeleitet. gr. 8. xxxvii, 79 S. Leipzig, *O. Harrassowits.* m. 4.

Horatius Flaccus (Q.) Oden u. Epoden. Erklärt v. Lucian Müller. 2 Thle. gr. 8. St. Petersburg, *K. L. Ricker.* m. 16.—1. Text u. Einleitungen. viii, 319 S.—2. Commentar. 479 S.

Ijzeren (J. van). De vitiis quibusdam principum codicum Aristophaneorum. gr. 8. xi, 114 S. Amsterdam, *Societas 'Elsevier.'* m. 3.

Kâṭhakam. Die Saṃhitâ der Kaṭha-Çâkhâ, hrsg. von Leop. v. Schroeder. 1. Buch. gr. 8. xiv, 285 S. Leipzig, *F. A. Brockhaus Sort. in Komm.* m. 12.

Digitized by Google

Kettner (Gust.) Die Episteln des Horaz. gr. 8. v, 178 S. Berlin, *Weidmann.* Geb., m. 3.60.

Laut- u. Formenlehre der altgermanischen Dialekte. Zum Gebrauch f. Studierende hrsg. v. Ferd. Dieter. 2. Halbbd.: Formenlehre des Urgermanischen, Gotischen, Altnordischen, Altenglischen, Altsächsischen u. Althochdeutschen. gr. 8. viii u. S. 345–790. Leipzig, *O. R. Reisland.* m. 9.

Nilsson (Mart. P. N.) Studia de Dionysiis atticis. gr. 8. iii, iv, 164 S. Lund, *Hj. Möller.* m. 3.50.

Persson (P.) De origine ac vi primigenia gerundii et gerundivi latini. gr. 8. iii, 138 S. Upsaliae. Leipzig, *O. Harrassowitz.* m. 2.80.

Price (J. M.) The Great Cylinder Inscriptions A and B of Gudea. Autographed, signs listed, tentatively transliterated and translated. With notes. Part 1: Text, Sign-list. Leipzig, 1900. 4to. vi, 34 S. m. 34.

Rohde (Erwin). Der griechische Roman u. seine Vorläufer. 2. durch Zusätze aus dem Handexemplar des Verf. u. durch den Vortrag üb. griech. Novellistik verm. Aufl. gr. 8. xix, 611 S. Leipzig, *Breitkopf & Härtel.* m. 14.

Thukydides. Erklärt v. J. Classen. 4. Bd. 4. Buch. 3. Aufl., bearb. v. J. Steup. gr. 8. iii, 313 S. Berlin, *Weidmann.* m. 3.

Uhlenbeck (C. C.) Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch der gotischen Sprache. 2. Aufl. gr. 8. vi, 179 S. Amsterdam, *J. Müller.* m. 5.

ITALIAN.

Bonaventura (Arn.) La poesia neo-latina in Italia dal secolo XIV al presente. Città di Castello, 1900. 16mo, p. xlvii, 362. L. 4.

Guissani (C.) Note Lucreziane. Torino, 1900. 8vo, p. 91. L. 2.

Pascal (Carlo). Commentationes vergilianae. Palermo. 16mo, p. 160. L. 3.

—— Studi sugli scrittori latini (Ennio, Plauto, Cicerone, Livio, Orazio, Tibullo). Torino. 8vo, p. 148. L. 5.

Digitized by Google

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Adams (H. B.) Public Libraries and Popular Education. (Home Educational Bulletin, No. 3. May, 1900.) Albany, *University of the State of N. Y.*, 1900.

—— The Church and Popular Education. (J. H. U. Studies in Historical and Political Science. Series XVIII, Nos. 8–9.) Baltimore, *Johns Hopkins Press*, 1900.

Aldrich (F. D.) and Foster (I. L.) Foundations of French. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1900.

American Journal of Archaeology. Vol. IV, No. 1, January–March, 1900. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*

Ἀθηνᾶ. Τόμος δωδέκατος. Τεῦχος τρίτον. Ἀθήνησιν, 1900.

Carter (J. B.) Selections from the Roman Elegiac Poets. With introduction and notes. New York, *University Publication Co.*, 1900. $1.40.

Dictionnaire général de la langue française, par Hatzfeld, Darmesteter et Thomas. Fascc. 29, 30, 31, 32 (fin.). Paris, *Delagrave*. @ 1 fr. la livraison.

Edwards (G. V.) The Ablative of Quality and the Genitive of Quality. (J. H. U. Diss.) 1899.

Euripides, The Medea of. With notes and an introduction by F. D. Allen. Revised ed., by Clifford H. Moore. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1900.

Fairbanks (Arthur). A Study of the Greek Paean. (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, no. XI.) New York, *The Macmillan Co.* $1.

Festschrift Johannes Vahlen zum siebenzigsten Geburtstag gewidmet von seinen Schülern. Berlin, *Reimer*, 1900. 24 m.

Gloth (C. M.) et Kellogg (M. F.) Index in Xenophontis Memorabilia. (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, no. XI.) New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1900. $1.

Goebel (Julius). Homunculus. (Sonderabdruck aus dem 'Goethe Jahrbuch,' Band 21.) 1900.

Gomperz (Theodor). Beiträge zur Kritik u. Erklärung griechischer Schriftsteller. VII. (Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Ak. der W. in Wien.) Wien, *Carl Gerold's Sohn*, 1900.

Harder (Chr.) Schulwörterbuch zu Homers Ilias u. Odyssee. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1900. 4 m.

Hempl (George). The Møjebro Runic Stone and the Runic Ligature for *NG*. (Reprinted from 'Public. of M. L. Ass.,' vol. XV, no. 2.)

Hermes. Herausg. v. Georg Kaibel u. Carl Robert. XXXV. Bd. 3. Heft. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1900.

Horatius (Q.) Flaccus. Auswahl von Michael Petschenig. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1900. Geb., m. 1.60.

Lawton (W. C.) Cicero: Coward and Patriot. (Sewanee Review, July, 1900.)

Digitized by Google

Lawton (W. C.) The Hamadryad and Her Kinsfolk. (Sewanee Review, Oct. 1900.)

Lewis (Charlton M.) The Beginnings of English Literature. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1900.

Meisterhans (K.) Grammatik der attischen Inschriften. 3. vermehrte u. verb. Aufl., besorgt von Eduard Schwyzer. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1900. 9 m.

Mitteis (Ludwig). Aus den griechischen Papyrusurkunden. Leipzig, *Teubner*, 1900. 1 m. 20.

Modern Language Association of America, Publications of the. Ed. by J. W. Bright. (Vol. XV, No. 3. N. S., Vol. VIII, No. 3.) XI. Schelling (F. E.) Tom Tyler and His Wife.—XII. Henneman (J. B.) The Episodes in Shakespeare's I Henry VI.—XIII. Goebel (Julius). The Germanic Suffix *-ar-ja*.—XIV. Bruce (J. D.) Vita Meriadoci. An Arthurian romance now first edited. Baltimore, *The Association*, 1900.

Muret-Sanders' Encyklopädisches Wörterbuch der englischen u. deutschen Sprache. Teil II: Deutsch-Englisch. Lfg. 17: Pacht--Reb-. Lfg. 18: Rebbes–Scheiben-. New York, *International News Co.* @ 1 m. 50.

Murray (J. A. H.) The Evolution of English Lexicography. The Romanes Lecture, 1900. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1900. 2s.

Muss-Arnolt (W.) Urim and Thummim. (Reprinted from the 'American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature,' July, 1900.)

National Educational Association, Proceedings of the. Department of Superintendence. Chicago, *The Association.*

Navarre (Octave). Essai sur la rhétorique grecque avant Aristote. Paris, *Hachette et Cie.*, 1900.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte u. deutsche Litteratur u. für Pädagogik. Herausg. v. Jo. Ilberg u. Rich. Richter. III. Jahrg. V. u. VI. Bandes. 6/7 Heft. Leipzig, *Teubner*, 1900.

Niese (Benedictus). Kritik der beiden Makkabäerbücher nebst Beiträgen zur Geschichte der makkabäischen Erhebung. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1900. 2 m. 40.

Oxford English Dictionary. Ed. by James A. H. Murray. GRADELY–GREEMENT (vol. IV). INFERABLE–INPUSHING (vol. V). Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, 91-93 Fifth Avenue. @ 2s, 6d. (60 cts.).

Plato. Charmides, Laches, and Lysis. Ed. by Barker Newhall. New York, *American Book Co.*, 1900.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Herausg. v. F. Buecheler u. H. Usener. N. F. LV 3. Frankfurt a/M., *Sauerländer*, 1900.

Sallustius (C. S. Crispus). The Bellum Catilinae, with introd. and vocabulary. By C. G. Herbermann. Revised edition. Boston, *B. H. Sanborn & Co.*, 1900. $1.

Schiller's Maria Stuart. Ed., with German comments, notes and questions, by Margaretha Müller and Clara Wenckebach. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1900.

Skrifter utgifna af Kongl. Humanistika Vetenskaps-Samfundet: Upsala. Band III och VI. Leipzig, *O. Harrowitz.* @ 12 m.

Sosii Fratres Bibliopolae. Carmen Praemio Aureo Ornatum. In certamine poetico Hoeufftiano. Accedunt septem carmina laudata. Amstelodami, *Ap. Io. Mullerum*, CIↃIↃCCCC.

Digitized by Google

Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature (Harvard). Vol. VI. Neilson (W. A.) The Origins and Sources of the Court of Love.—Vol. VII. I. Ford (J. D. M.) The Old Spanish Sibilants. II. Brown (A. C. L.) The Round Table before Wace. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1900.

Taciti (Cornelii) De origine, situ, moribus ac populis Germanorum liber. Recens. Io. Müller. Lipsiae, *Freytag*, MDCCCC. 40 pf.—Ed. maior. 60 pf.

Tamblyn (W. F.) The Establishment of Roman Power in Britain. (Columbia University Diss.) Hamilton, Ontario, 1899.

Thomas (M. Carey). Education of Women. Monographs on Education for Department of Education. (U. S. Commission to the Paris Exposition of 1900.)

Thukydides. Erklärt von J. Classen. IV. Bd. 3. Aufl. Bearbeitet von J. Steup. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1900. 3 m.

Tōkyō Imperial University Calendar. 1899–1900.

Tüselmann (Otto). Die Paraphrase des Euteknios zu Oppians Kynegetika. (Abhandlungen der Königl. Gesellsch. der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Phil.-hist. Klasse. N. F. Bd. IV. No. 1.) Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1900. 3 m.

Wilbrandt (Adolf). Der Meister von Palmyra. Dramatische Dichtung. Ed. with introduction and notes by Théodore Henckels. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago, *American Book Co.*, 1900. 80 cts.

Wilhelm (Adolf). Der Dichter Antiphon aus Athen. Zwei Inschriften aus Paros. Nachlese zu griechischen Inschriften. (Sonderabdruck aus den 'Jahresheften des österr. archäolog. Institutes.' Band II.) 1900.

—— Ἔτος u. ἐνιαυτός. (Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Ak. der Wissenschaften in Wien. Band CXLI.) Wien, *Carl Gerold's Sohn*, 1900.

—— Rez. von Ch. Michel's Recueil d'inscriptions grecques. (Gött. gelehrt. Anz., 1900, Nr. 2.)

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Little Page

VOL. XXI, 4 WHOLE NO. 84

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
MAR 9 1901
THE
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY

BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE

PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

BALTIMORE: THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
LONDON: KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & CO.
LEIPSIC: F. A. BROCKHAUS

OCTOBER, NOVEMBER, DECEMBER
1900

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS.

I.—The Athenian Democracy in the Light of Greek Literature. By Abby Leach, ... 361

II.—The Ocean in Sanskrit Epic Poetry. By Washburn Hopkins, . 378

III.—The Greek in Cicero's Epistles. By R. B. Steele, . . . 387

IV.—On the Wedding Stanza, Rig-Veda, x. 40. 10. By Maurice Bloomfield, ... 411

V.—The Manuscripts of the Letters of Cicero to Atticus in the Vatican Library. By Samuel Ball Platner, ... 420

VI.—Note on Acharnians 947. By Campbell Bonner, . . . 433

VII.—The *æ/a/v* of 'are,' 'father,' 'rather.' By George Hempl, . . 438

Notes: 443

On Greek and Latin Negatives. By Frank H. Fowler.—On the Septuagint Text of I Samuel 20. 3 and Epistle of Jeremiah 26. By John Wesley Rice.

Reviews and Book Notices: 448

Schmalz's Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik.—Koch's Kaiser Julian der Abtrünnige; seine Jugend und Kriegsthaten bis zum Tode des Kaisers Constantius (331–361).—Rothstein's Die Elegien des Sextus Propertius.

Reports: 463

Philologus.—Rheinisches Museum für Philologie.

Brief Mention, ... 470

Recent Publications, ... 477

Books Received, ... 481

Index, ... 484

Open to original communications in all departments of philology, classical, comparative, oriental, modern; condensed reports of current philological work; summaries of chief articles in the leading philological journals of Europe; reviews by specialists; bibliographical lists. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price $3.00 a year, payable to the publisher in advance; single numbers, $1.00 each. Suitable advertisements will be inserted at the following rates:

	1 time.	2 t.	3 t.	4 t.
One page	$16 00	$30 00	$40 00	$50 00
Half page	8 00	15 00	20 00	25 00
Quarter page	4 00	8 00	12 00	15 00
Eighth page	2 00	4 00	6 00	8 00

The English Agents of the American Journal of Philology are Messrs. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Paternoster House, Charing Cross Road, London, W. C.

Special Notice.—The stock of complete sets of The American Journal of Philology has passed over into the hands of the undersigned. These sets will be sold for the present at the regular price, $63 for the twenty-one volumes, cash to accompany the order. Single volumes, $3; single numbers, $1 each, so far as they can be supplied. Address

The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

Published quarterly. Three dollars a year (postage paid). Entered at the Postoffice of Baltimore, Md., as second-class matter.

Press of The Friedenwald Co.
Baltimore, Md.

Digitized by Google

AMERICAN

JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXI, 4. WHOLE NO. 84.

I.—THE ATHENIAN DEMOCRACY IN THE LIGHT OF GREEK LITERATURE.[1]

The Athenian Democracy is perhaps the best exemplification we have of a true democracy—a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. True, there were slaves with no political rights and resident aliens with restricted citizenship, but this circumstance does not invalidate the integrity of the statement that Athens was a democracy. Jealously as the Athenians guarded the privilege of citizenship and strict as they were to keep out the taint of alien blood, yet foreigners kept finding their way into the ranks of citizens, as the indignant protests and sarcasms of Aristophanes prove. Birds 1527: 'Have you barbarian gods up there in Olympus?' 'Of course,' is the answer. 'Are they not barbarians from whom Exekestides has his family god?' This Exekestides was a naturalized foreigner. Frogs 727–33: 'We insult the citizens whom we know to be well-born and sensible, just and good and honorable men, who have been trained in the palaestras and choruses and music, while we use for every purpose the brazen, red-haired foreigners, rascals and sprung from rascals, who are the latest comers.' 'Kleisthenes,' says Aristotle in Politics 1275 b 37, 'after the expulsion of the tyrants, admitted into the tribes many resident aliens of foreign and servile extraction.'

As for the slaves, the best authorities give the aggregate number for all Attica as not much in excess of 100,000 at any

[1] President's Address at the thirty-first meeting of the American Philological Association, Madison, Wisc., July, 1900.

Digitized by Google

period, and manumissions were frequent. 'Luckless that I am!' exclaims the slave of Dionysus in Frogs 33. 'Why did I not take part in the naval battle? Then I could have told you to shout yourself hoarse.' This refers to the emancipation of the slaves who took part in the battle of Arginusae. Aeschines, in his speech against Ctesiphon 41, shows that this practice of freeing slaves was common. 'Some were in the habit of announcing the manumission of their slaves at the Great Dionysia in the theatre, thereby making the Hellenes witness of their action.' That the slaves were mildly treated is attested by the author of the Ath. Const. 1, 10: 'The license allowed to slaves and sojourners at Athens is very great; it is not allowed to strike them, nor will the slave yield you the way.' Isoc. Panegyricus 123: 'No one of us treats his slaves as the Spartans chastise their freemen.'

While, then, economic conditions were somewhat affected by slavery, in general there seems little difference between slaves as we find them at Athens, mildly treated and with the hope of freedom before them, and a large class of our own laborers, who are ignorant foreigners without any interest in our country beyond the gaining a mere livelihood. Moreover, one can hardly call a people a slave-holding aristocracy when three obols a day (about nine cents) was sufficient inducement to make them take active part in the duties of a citizen. And the humble callings seem to have been well represented in the Assembly. Protagoras 319: 'When some question of civil administration is to be discussed, then without distinction they rise and offer their minds upon it—carpenter, smith and shoemaker, rich and poor, those of high birth or low degree.' 'Neither is poverty a bar,' says Perikles in his funeral oration (Thuc. II 37), 'but a man may benefit his country, whatever be the obscurity of his condition.'

Bluntschli says: "Democracy found its most logical expression in Athens, and its nature can nowhere be better studied than in the Athenian constitution" (The Theory of the State, p. 432). And it may fairly be claimed that Athens was a typical democracy because the population was so small that the people took part directly in the government, and not by representatives, and were bound together closely by a common religion and language, by common interests, and love of a common country. Then, too, life was less complex than now, not crossed and recrossed with the intricate and puzzling questions of these latter days, and so,

Digitized by Google

in this miniature democracy, the tendencies and workings of a democracy stand out clearly to view. It is therefore well worth while to study this democracy in the light of the testimony of contemporaries, and see what are the real dangers when the people have full control of affairs.

The period one has in mind in speaking of the Athenian Democracy is the period that marks the highest achievement of the people and the culmination of their power, and ends with the disastrous defeat of Chaeroneia, the democracy of the 5th and 4th centuries—from the time that Kleisthenes 'took the demos into partnership' to the days of Demosthenes, when the demos was supreme. Yet it is hard in any period to set definite limits to the Athenian constitution, for in the words of Heracleitos: 'Nothing is, everything is becoming.' But through all there is a constant gain in the ascendency of the people.

Although the Solonian constitution seems to have been designed to be a mixed form of government, as Solon claims when he says:

> I gave to the mass of the people such rank as befitted their need,
> I took not away their honor, and I granted naught to their greed;
> But those who were rich in power, who in wealth were glorious and great,
> I bethought me that naught should befall them unworthy their splendor and state;
> And I stood with my shield outstretched, and both were safe in its sight,
> And I would not that either should triumph when the triumph was not with right.—Plut. Sol. 18.

yet the tendency was unquestionably towards democracy, because of the judicial power he gave the people. He appears to have instituted the popular courts, made up of citizens chosen by lot, having jurisdiction over all manner of suits and passing judgment upon any magistrate whose conduct in office had been questioned. Holding the power of criticism and punishment as they did, we can understand Aristotle's remark: 'The demos, when it is master of the voting pebble, becomes master of the constitution' (Ath. Const. 35). Hence, Aristotle says, some in his time blamed Solon, because, they said, he neutralized the other forces in the state by making the courts of people chosen by lot supreme over all matters, 'for when the law-courts increased in power, statesmen, by paying court to the demos, now the tyrant-power, changed the constitution into the democracy of the present day' (Arist. Politics 1294 a). Aristotle does not disagree with the conclusion as an historical fact, but he attributes it, not to the wish of Solon, but to

Digitized by Google

the course of events. The interesting point is, that from the time the people had power, statesmen played into their hands for selfish ends, not for the good of the state, and made the people absolute rulers.

It is not necessary for my purpose to give an elaborate account of the Kleisthenean constitution or to define exactly the functions of the different officials and governing bodies, but it is worth while to call attention to the fact that every Athenian citizen was a member of the ekklesia before which all important questions of state were brought and decided, and the Boule of Five Hundred was chosen by lot out of the whole body of citizens yearly, so that, as Warde Fowler says, it was simply a large committee of the whole people elected afresh every year. Then there were various officials and boards for the different departments, chosen for the most part by lot, so that in the Ath. Const. 24 the number for the age of Aristeides is reckoned at 1400. From this it will be seen what an active part the citizens took in affairs of state, when 1900 out of a population not much above 30,000 were in office each year, for the most part chosen by lot. In the constant exercise of political power and in service in the law-courts, the people had a liberal training in legal and political questions, and so the sovereign power was vested not simply in the people, but in a people singularly well-fitted to exercise it. "A paramount people," in the words of Jebb, "taught by life itself to reason and judge" (Attic Orators, p. 325). 'We alone,' says Perikles in his famous funeral oration (Thuc. II 45), 'regard a man who takes no interest in public affairs, not as a harmless but as a useless character; and if few of us are originators, we are all sound judges of a policy.'

What, then, is democracy in the definition of the Greeks? In Thuc. II 37, Perikles thus defines it: 'It is true that we are called a democracy, for the administration is in the hands of the many, and not of the few. But while the law secures equal justice to all alike in their private disputes, the claim of excellence is also recognized; and when a citizen is in any way distinguished, he is preferred to the public service, not as a matter of privilege, but as the reward of merit.' In other words, democracy means equal opportunities and equal rights. This is the ideal view. In the Politics, VII 2, Aristotle says: 'The primary principle of a democratical polity is personal liberty. Justice, in the democratical view, consists in equality as determined not by merit, but arith-

Digitized by Google

metically—that is, by merely counting heads; and where this is the principle of justice, it necessarily follows that the masses are supreme. For the theory being that all the citizens should share alike, the result is that in a democracy the poor exercise a higher authority than the rich; for they constitute a majority of the population, and the will of the majority is supreme.' And again in the 6th book, 6th chap., he says: 'Not only do all the inhabitants theoretically enjoy political privileges, but they actually exercise them in the conduct of political business, as even the poor are enabled by the pay they receive to enjoy the leisure (necessary to political life). And in fact it is a population of this kind which has the largest amount of leisure; for they are not impeded in any way by the management of their private affairs, as is the case with the rich, who are thus frequently prevented from attending the Assembly or the Courts of Law. The consequence is that it is the mass of the poor rather than the laws that become the supreme authority in the polity.' And again B. III, c. 8: 'Democracy is a government where the supreme power is vested in those who possess no considerable property, i. e. the poor.' 'A charming form of government' are Plato's sarcastic words in the Republic 558, 'full of variety and disorder, and dispensing a sort of equality to equals and unequals alike.' And he thinks the dominant characteristic of a democracy is an insatiate thirst for freedom, so that 'the son is on a level with his father, having no respect or reverence for either of his parents, and the metic is equal with the citizen and the citizen with the metic, and the stranger is quite as good as either,' and the animals are actually affected, he humorously adds: 'The horses and asses have a way of marching along with all the rights and dignities of freemen, and they will run at anybody who comes in their way, if he does not leave the road clear for them: and all things are just ready to burst with liberty' (Republic 563).

The Periklean age is justly extolled as the great period in the history of Athens and the time when the democracy was at its best. But according to Thuc. II 65 it was really the government of the best man. He says: 'Thus Athens, though in name a democracy, was in fact ruled by her greatest citizen. But his successors were more on an equality with one another, and each one struggling to be first himself, they were ready to sacrifice the whole conduct of affairs to the whims of the people. Occupied in intriguing against one another for the leadership of the democ-

Digitized by Google

racy, they not only grew remiss in the management of the army, but became embroiled for the first time in civil strife.' Aristotle, looking backward, says, Ath. Const. 27: 'Under Perikles the constitution became still more democratic. As Perikles could not compete with Kimon in wealth and win popular favor by a like magnificent liberality, he took the advice of Damonides, which was that he should make presents to the people from their own property; and accordingly he instituted pay for the members of the law-courts.' In the Gorgias 519, Socrates proves that Perikles as well as Themistokles and Kimon were not good statesmen; for he says: 'As to using the powers which they had in the improvement of their fellow-citizens, which is the prime object of the truly good citizen, I do not see that in these respects they were a whit superior to our present statesmen, though I admit that they were more clever at providing ships and walls and docks, and all that.' And in 575 E: 'I hear that Perikles made the Athenians idle and cowardly and chatterers and lovers of money by first instituting pay for public service.'

It would seem, then, that the tendency of a democracy is to put the power into the hands of the masses, and that while the Periklean age was great because a great man controlled affairs, yet in adding to the power of the people that he might gain control, Perikles was largely responsible for bringing about the unlimited sovereignty of the people, which, in the hands of unscrupulous leaders, wrought the ruin of Athens. For the policy of fostering the supremacy of the people led, as it always does lead, to the rise of demagogues, and so we read in Arist., Const. of Athens, 28: 'After Kleophon, the popular leadership was occupied successively by the men who chose to talk the biggest and pander to the tastes of the majority, with their eyes fixed only on the interests of the moment.' In the Knights of Aristophanes, 40 ff., exhibited in 424 B. C., the demos is personified as head of a household. 'The first of the month,' one complains, 'he bought a slave, the Paphlagonian tanner, basest of scoundrels. This tanner, fully understanding his master's disposition, flatters him and fawns upon him and deceives him with bits of endearment. The Paphlagonian runs round to the slaves and begs and gets bribes, saying, "You see Hylas got a flogging, owing to me"; so we give.' The Paphlagonian slave is Kleon, of whom Thuc. III 36 says: 'This man, the most violent of the citizens at that time, exercised the greatest influence over the people.' And Aristotle,

Digitized by Google

Const. of Athens, 28, claims that he, more than any one else, was the cause of the corruption of the democracy by his wild undertakings. Alkibiades says: 'But there were demagogues, as there always have been, who led the people into evil ways' (Thuc. VI 89). Euripides has many strong words on the same theme—Supp. 409–25: 'For the city whence I come is ruled by one man only, not by the mob. None there puffs up the citizens with specious words and for his own advantage twists them this way or that.'

In a democracy there is always danger that unscrupulous men will rise to power by cunning manipulation of the people, by pandering to their baser natures instead of trying to influence them for their own good and the good of the state. Witness the supreme sway of the 'Boss' in our own country.

Side by side with the demagogues we find the orators, who exercised their spell for evil or for good, as the case might be, over the susceptible minds of the hearers. Isoc. Antidosis, Or. XV 249: 'For the Athenians consider Persuasion one of the gods, and they see the city yearly make a sacrifice to her.' Perikles, able statesman and general though he was, seems to have owed his power largely to his eloquence. 'This man,' says Eupolis, 'whenever he came forward, proved himself the greatest orator among men; like a good runner, he could give the other speakers 10 feet start and win. Rapid, you call him, but beside his swiftness a certain persuasion sat upon his lips. Such was his spell and alone of the speakers, he ever left his sting in the hearers' (Jebb, Att. Or. CXXX). Aristophanes, Acharnians 530, speaking of the outbreak of the war, says: 'Perikles, the Olympian, was thundering and lightening and putting all Greece in a tumult.' Plato, in the Phaedrus says: 'Perikles was the most accomplished of all orators.' Little wonder then that Perikles held firm sway, though the people in their fickleness turned against him from time to time, and from July 430 to July 429 kept him out of office, having charged him with embezzlement and fined him fifty talents.

But too many used their gifts for selfish ends. Eur. Hipp. 486–9: ''Tis even this, too plausible a tongue, that overthrows good governments and homes of men. We should not speak to please the ear, but to point the path that leads to noble fame.' Eur. Or. 902–11: 'Next stood up a fellow who can not close his lips, one whose impudence is his strength, an alien forced on us,

Digitized by Google

confident in bluster and licensed ignorance, and plausible enough to involve his hearers in some mischief sooner or later; for when a man with a pleasing trick of speech, but of unsound principles, persuades the mob, it is a serious evil to the state.' This is supposed to refer to Kleophon, the lyre-maker, who, after having been dressed with a little brief authority, was condemned to death by the people. Demosthenes, ag. Leptines 166, says: 'Many a time, instead of it being proved to you that measures were just, they have been extorted from you by the clamor and violence and impudence of the speakers.' And again in the 3d Olynthiac, 22: 'But since these orators have appeared who ask, What is your pleasure? What shall I move? How can I oblige you?—the public welfare is complimented away for a moment's popularity, and these are the results: the orators thrive, you are disgraced.' Also 3d Phil. 4: 'And the people then, as always, were easily flattered and deceived.' Knights 1342: 'Whenever any one said in the Assembly, "Demos, I am your lover, and I love you and care for you and alone provide for you," whenever any one used these preambles, you used to clap your wings and crow and hold your head high, and then, in return for this, he cheated you.' And again, 1110 ff.: 'Demos, you possess a fine sovereignty when all men dread you as a tyrant. Yet you are easily led by the nose, and you delight in being flattered and cajoled, and gape open-mouthed at whoever happens to be speaking, and your mind, though present, is abroad.'

But there are other means of persuasion than artful speech, and charges of bribery are a commonplace with the orators. In the 3d Phil. 36–40, with trenchant words Demosthenes exclaims: 'There was something, men of Athens, something in the hearts of the multitude then, which there is not now, which overcame the wealth of Persia and maintained the freedom of Greece, and quailed not under any battle by land or sea! What was this? Nothing subtle or clever; simply that whoever took money from the aspirants for power or the corrupters of Greece was universally detested: it was dreadful to be convicted of bribery, the severest punishment was inflicted on the guilty, and there was no intercession or pardon. What do we see now? Everywhere a man gets a bribe—laughter if he confesses it, mercy to the convicted, hatred of those that denounce the crime, all the usual attendants upon corruption.' 'What, then, becomes of the rest of the revenue?' the bewildered old man asks his son in the

Digitized by Google

Wasps 660; and the answer is: 'It goes to these who say "I will not betray the noisy crowd of the Athenians, but will always fight for the Democratic party."' 'Having gained over the whole senate for an obol worth of coriander seed' (Knights 680). Ps.-Xen. Ath. Const. 241: 'Yet some say that if a suitor applies to the senate or the people with money in his hand, he will get his business done.' And Isocrates, On the Peace 169, says: 'Although the penalty of death has been enacted in case any one is convicted of bribery, yet we elect those who do this most openly, and the man who has means to bribe the majority of the citizens, we set over the highest affairs of state.' We have heard of such things outside of degenerate Athens. Closely allied to this charge is that of enrichment from office. In the Lys. of Aristophanes it is asked: 'Are they fighting on account of money?' 'Yes,' is the answer. 'For in order that Peisander might be able to steal, and those who aim at offices, they were always stirring up some commotions.' In the speech against Aristocrates, Demosthenes says: 'Aristeides, who was empowered to assess the tribute, did not increase his fortune by a single drachma; but when he died, the country buried him. Now, the persons who manage our state affairs have risen from indigence to wealth, and provided themselves with plenty to last them for support.' 'In our day,' says Aristotle, Pol. 1279a, 10, 'the advantages derived from the public treasury and from office make men desire to hold it uninterruptedly. One might suppose that, though of sickly constitution, they were always well in office, for then, too, they would no doubt hunt as eagerly after places.'

But I find in Greek literature no more despairing words than Bryce's in The Am. Commonwealth, II 344: "In the United States tenets and policies, points of political doctrine and points of political practice have all vanished: all has been lost except office and the hope of it." And in II 485–9: "Place-hunting is the career: and an office is not a public trust, but a means of requiting party services and, also, a source whence party funds may be raised for election purposes." And in speaking of John Quincy Adams, Goldwin Smith says: "As he was about the last President chosen for merit, not for availability, so he was about the last whose only rule was not party but the public service." And the people are content to have it so. 'The people at Athens know very well which of the citizens are good and which are bad,' says Isocrates in the Panegyricus, 'but while they know this, they

Digitized by Google

love those who are of use and advantage to themselves, even though they be bad.' And in the Areopagitikos 206: 'Chatting in the workshops we admit that never under a democracy was there worse government, but in practice we are content to have it so.' 'While they entrust their private interests only to men of long-tried honesty,' says Demosthenes ag. Aristogeiton, 'they will confide the interests of the Commonwealth to men whose baseness has been proved beyond dispute.' 'See, too, the forgiving spirit of democracy,' says Plato, contemptuously, Rep. 558, 'and the don't-care-about-trifles, and the disregard she shows of all the fine principles we solemnly laid down,—how grandly does she trample all these fine notions of ours under her feet, never giving a thought to the pursuits which make a statesman, and promoting to honor any one who professes to be the people's friend!'

The Athenians were a humane people in general, but when they had become imperialists, the love of empire made them overbearing and cruel. Perikles himself says: 'Your empire has become a tyranny which in the opinion of mankind may have been unjustly gained, but which can not be safely surrendered' (Thuc. II 63). And Aristotle, Pol. 1384, 40, says: 'The Athenians had no sooner got the empire securely in their hands than, in defiance of their treaty obligations, they crushed the islands, Samos and Chios and Lesbos.' In their argument with the Melians, whom they were trying to coerce into an alliance, they bluntly say: 'The powerful exact what they can and the weak grant what they must' (Thuc. V 89). 'We are masters of the sea, and you who are islanders, and insignificant islanders too, must not be allowed to escape us' (V 97). This seems to be the language of imperialism at all times, Christian or Pagan. In the sacred name of progress and civilization, the weak must be coerced. And when the Athenians had conquered the people of Melos, whose only crime was their refusal to surrender the liberty they had enjoyed for 700 years, in the dispassionate words of Thuc. V 116: 'The Athenians thereupon put to death all who were of military age and made slaves of the women and children.' And these were the liberty-loving Athenians!

Calm self-control and stability of policy, sweet reasonableness and cool, dispassionate judgments and clear-sightedness, must not be looked for in the rank and file of mankind, and so we find Aristophanes, in Knights 40, characterizing the demos as choleric

Digitized by Google

and crabbed, while Demosthenes, On the Embassy 135–6, charges Aeschines with saying to Philip that 'the people is of all things the most unstable and inconstant, like a restless wind put in motion by any accident.' And Isocrates, in the Antidosis 172, declares that 'public opinion is irregular and vehement as a winter torrent.' Euripides echoes the same thought in Or. 696–703: 'When the people fall into a fury and their rage is still fresh, they are as hard to appease as a fierce fire is to quench . . . As soon as they have spent their rage, thou mayest obtain whatever thou wilt from them without any trouble, for they have a natural sense of pity and a hot temper too, an invaluable quality, if you watch it closely.' Their history gives many sorry illustrations of this, notably in Thuc. III 36 ff., where the Athenians, incensed against the people of Mytilene because they had dared to revolt, having conquered, voted to put to death all the grown-up citizens and to enslave the women and children, and actually despatched a trireme to carry the message of doom. Happily, on the following day remorse seized them, and, though Kleon protested and warned them that their empire was a despotism and so must be maintained by force, they listened to more humane counsels, for they began to reflect that a decree which doomed to destruction not only the guilty, but a whole city, was cruel and monstrous—and it certainly would have been.

The people are always slow to blame themselves and will not face coolly the consequences of their own acts. After the terrible defeat in Sicily they were furious with the orators who had joined in promoting the expedition. 'As if,' says the historian, 'they had not voted it themselves!' (Thuc. VIII 1). However, even after this overwhelming disaster, they determined still to resist, and set about measures of defence. 'For, after the manner of a democracy,' says Thucydides, VIII 1, 'they were very amenable to discipline while their fright lasted.' Perikles charges them with fickleness when they were angry with him because the war and the plague caused them grievous distress. 'If, when you determined to go to war, you believed me to have somewhat more of the statesman in me than others, it is not fair that I should now be charged with crime. You think my advice was wrong, because your own characters are weak. Your minds have not the strength to persevere in your resolution, now that a great reverse has overtaken you unawares' (Thuc. II 60, 61; VII 5, 9). Nikias, caring more for his personal interests than the

Digitized by Google

good of the state, when ruin was staring his army in the face, flatly refused to leave Sicily for fear of the Athenians. He declared they would not forgive the generals, if these departed without an order from home, but would be convinced by any accusations that a clever speaker might bring forward. 'Knowing the temper of the Athenians, he would take his chance and fall by the hands of the enemy rather than die unjustly at the hands of the Athenians' (Thuc. VII 48). At the time of the mutilation of the Hermae, Thucydides says: 'They did not investigate the character of the informers, but, in their suspicious mood, listened to all manner of statements and seized and imprisoned some of the most respected citizens on the evidence of wretches. They were in a state of incessant fear and suspicion' (VI 53). And the account of Andocides gives a vivid picture of their alarm and excitement at that time, that made them credulous listeners to any accusations.

Aristophanes ludicrously describes their attitude of mind in Wasps 488 ff.: 'How everything with you is tyranny and conspirators, when I have not heard the word—no, not for half a century. If any one ask for a leek as a relish for his anchovies, the woman who sells herbs, with a sly wink, says: "Look here, you ask for a leek; is it for a tyranny?"' After the glorious victory of Arginusae, the Athenians, in a fury against the generals because they thought these might have picked up the dead and dying, put them to death without a fair trial—as foolish an action as it was wicked, for they sorely needed all their generals. Not long afterwards they repented, and prosecuted those who had deceived the people (Xen. Hell. I 185), thereby fulfilling the judgment of Aristotle in the Ath. Const. 28: 'For the people, even if they are deceived for a time, in the end generally come to detest those who have beguiled them into any unworthy action.' All very well, but, unfortunately, the mischief is usually done before this healthy repentance asserts itself. Greenidge, in his Outlines of Greek Constitutional History, p. 179, says of Athens: "Few states have ever been more completely under the sway of great personalities," but certainly the Athenians lacked the wisdom to get the best good out of their great men. Alcibiades is a conspicuous example. His undoubted talents were a direct injury to the state because the people foolishly followed him too far sometimes and sometimes not far enough, while they trusted the timorous Nikias with a confidence as ungrounded as

Digitized by Google

it was fatal. His private virtues seem to have blinded their eyes to his impotent generalship.

Aristotle is frequently quoted as the champion of the majority, and it is true that he makes a strong claim for the many when he says, Pol. III, c. 11: 'It is possible that the many, of whom each individual is not a virtuous man, are still collectively superior to the few best persons.' And again: 'As the multitude collectively may be compared to an individual with many feet, hands and senses, so the same is true of their character and intelligence. But,' he continues, 'whether the superiority of the many to the few virtuous persons is possible, whatever the character of the people or the masses, is uncertain or perhaps, by Zeus, in some cases impossible.' And in Pol. IV, c. 9, he would rule out from citizenship husbandmen, artisans, and hired laborers generally, on the claim that neither mechanics, nor any other members of the state who do not cultivate virtue—virtue with wisdom, be it understood—are entitled to political rights. His majority is a select majority. True to his philosophy that finds all excellence in the mean, he says the best political association is the one controlled by the middle class, and commends for its wisdom the prayer of Phokylides:

> 'The middle class within the state
> Fares best, I ween;
> May I be neither low nor great,
> But e'en between.'

And in the Ath. Const. he gives high praise, as does Thuc. VIII 97, to the temporary government of the 5000, which was made up of all those who had money enough to furnish themselves with military equipment. He, as well as Plato, would agree with Goethe's definition, so far as a merely numerical majority is concerned: 'A few strong men who lead, some knaves who temporize, and the weak multitude, who follow without the faintest idea of what they want.' 'The bulk of mankind,' says Aristotle, Nic. Eth. X 9, 'live by feeling. They pursue the pleasures they like and the means thereto, and shun the contrary pains; but they have no thought of, as they have no taste for, what is right and truly sweet.' And again: 'The many yield to force rather than to reason, and to fear of punishment rather than to the beautiful.' Lilly puts the case strongly in First Principles in Politics, p. 193: "Do the annals of the world show that the

Digitized by Google

unreasoning instinct of the masses has been invariably or even frequently right? Why, from the beginning their choice has fallen upon Barabbas!"

The decadence of Athens is accounted for in various ways by different historians, and the change from the military state of the 5th century to the trading and industrial state of the 4th, is sufficient explanation to many of the decline of Athens. Hired soldiers had now taken the place of native troops, and the citizens shrank from military service. The speeches of Demosthenes ring with earnest appeals to the citizens to shake off their lethargy and love of ease, and, in the spirit of other days, brave the enemy in the field; but the fundamental cause lay much deeper. The Sophists, as Plato saw, flourished at Athens because their teaching was of the showy, superficial kind that makes one clever at winning one's case, whether in law-courts or assemblies, and democracy exalts not the wise but the successful political leader; so Kallikles, the would-be statesman, was the friend of Gorgias, who taught the art of rhetoric. Plato sees no hope for the man of noble nature and high aims in this government where the whims of the many determine the rules of action; but he says, Republic 496 A: 'Such a man, seeing the folly of the many and seeing that they do nothing sound in the management of the affairs of state, like a man fallen among wild beasts, feeling the futility of resistance, keeps quiet and manages his own affairs, and, taking refuge under the shelter of a wall, as it were, in a storm of dust whirled on by the blast, he is content if he can live his life here free from injustice and unholy deeds, and, when his time comes, can depart hence in peace with good hope.'

The life of the Athenians was so closely bound up with the life of the state that their philosophers and thinkers were constantly trying to find a remedy for the glaring evils in political life, because they felt that the individual life could not reach its perfection unless the state was perfect too. Over and over again the orators assert their confident belief that the safety and prosperity of the state will be secure, if the people will only turn a deaf ear to corrupt statesmen, follow the path of virtue, and faithfully administer the laws. Dem. ag. Leptines 154: 'If all truly fearing the penalties of the laws would abstain from evil courses, and all competing for the rewards of good service would determine to do their duty, what prevents our city from being mighty and all from being honest men, without a bad one among us?' Dem. ag. Aristo-

Digitized by Google

geiton, A. 776: 'Since, then, it is acknowledged that, next to the gods, it is the laws which preserve the Commonwealth, you should act, all of you, in the same manner as if you were sitting here to make up a club subscription. Him that obeys the laws, you should praise and honor, as a person contributing his full share to the welfare of his country; him that disobeys them, you should punish.' Dem. ag. Meidias 224–5: 'What is the strength of the laws? If any of you is injured and cries out, will they run to the rescue and help him? No; they are but written words and they are not able to do this. In what, then, is the power of the laws? In your enforcing them and making them effectual for those who need them. You should defend them just the same as you would defend yourselves against injustice, and regard the wrongs of the laws, by whomsoever they are committed, as matters of public concern. And there should be no services, no compassion, no influence, no contrivance, nothing whatsoever by which a man who has transgressed the laws can escape the penalty.' Aesch. ag. Ctes. 36: 'When the laws are guarded, the democracy is preserved.' Deinarchus ag. Dem. 72: 'Men of Athens, why do you think cities fare now well and now ill? You will find nothing else the cause than their counsellors and leaders.'

But the philosophers are more radical, and the remedy they find is in education. 'The greatest safeguard for the permanence of any polity,' says Aristotle, Pol. VIII, c. 9, 'is one which is universally disregarded at present, viz. the education of the citizens in the spirit of the polity. For the wisest of the laws are of no avail, unless the citizens are trained by habit and education in the lines of the polity.' The Athenian democracy, on the testimony of their own writers, seems to show the same tendencies and to have the same dangers that we find in our own country, only here on a larger scale and with innumerable complications, and so the word of warning from that little city-state with its luminous thinkers may well be heeded. In the words of Plato, Rep. 521: 'If men go into the administration of public affairs beggars and hungering after their own advantage, thinking that from this source they are to snatch the chief good, the state can never be well governed, for then office becomes an object of strife and the factions that ensue will ruin themselves and the whole state as well.'

The great danger to any democracy is, as Arnold says, "the danger that comes from the multitude being in power, with no

Digitized by Google

adequate ideal to elevate or guide the multitude" (Democracy, p. 20). The safeguard lies in education, the education that is fundamental, that develops, as Plato teaches, the whole man, physically, intellectually and morally, and stamps ineffaceable ideals upon the heart and mind. But all are not capable of the highest attainments, as Plato believes, and he solemnly urges the recognition of inequality, and divides men allegorically into those with gold in their hearts; second, with silver; and third, with only brass and iron; and he insists that the only hope for the state is when the highly endowed by Nature, who have received the noblest culture, are the leaders and rulers. Mill, Considerations on Representative Government, p. 174, pronounces "the belief, whether express or tacit, that any one man is as good as any other, almost as detrimental to moral and intellectual excellence as any effect which most forms of government can produce." And Giddings, in Democracy and Empire, pp. 212 and 213, says: "Differences of mental ability and of moral power will always exist among men; and by a law that is absolute in the realm of mind as the law of gravitation is in the physical world, inferior men will continue to defer to their superiors, to believe dicta instead of thinking propositions and to imitate examples instead of originating them. Leadership of some kind men must and will have." And the problem for all time is how, on the one hand, to train those into noble living and thinking upon whom Nature herself has put the stamp of greatness, and, on the other, to train the people into a desire to have such men as their rulers and leaders; but instead of trying to solve this problem, Plato, Rep. 493 B, says the would-be statesmen consider statesmanship or, rather, practical politics to be 'a study of the disposition and desires of the great strong beast, the people; when to approach him and touch him, and when he is fiercest and gentlest, and from what causes, and by what sounds he is tamed or enraged, and so, without any true knowledge of the noble and base, good and evil, just and unjust, by virtue of this experience, they name everything according to the humors of the great beast, calling that good in which he delights and that bad with which he is displeased.' An admirable picture of the ear-to-the-ground political leader or the one with his finger on the people's pulse! "Herbert Spencer," says Lecky, in Democracy and Liberty, p. 226, "has said with profound truth and wisdom that the end which the statesman should keep in view as higher than all other

Digitized by Google

ends, is the formation of character. It is on this side," he adds, "that democratic politics seem to me peculiarly weak."

"The great peril of Hellas was the selfish blindness of political leaders" (Lloyd, Age of Perikles, p. 401). Ekklesiazusae 174: 'For I see the state always employing bad leaders, and if any be good for one day, he is bad for ten.' 'As all the functions (of government),' says Aristotle, Pol., b. VI, c. 4, 'ought to be discharged, and nobly and justly discharged, in a state, it is indispensable that there should be also a class of public men endowed with virtue.' Plato, Rep. 374: 'The good take office not with the feeling that they are entering upon something good or that they will have enjoyment in holding it, but as something necessary and because they are not able to entrust it to any better than themselves, or even as good.' In other words, they take office as a trust and their "thoughts shoot beyond the vulgar white of personal aims." "The end of the state," says Lilly, First Principles in Politics, p. 51, "is what Aristotle calls εὖ ζῆν, noble or worthy life. The roots of human progress are probity, honour, the capacity of self-sacrifice, the subordination to high ideals."

And the last word shall be Plato's, Rep. 499–500: 'O my friend, do not attack the multitude. They will hold a different opinion if, not in a contentious spirit but with a view to soothing them and removing their dislike of over-education, you show them what you mean by philosophers and describe their character and profession. But a man who in word and work is perfectly moulded, as far as he can be, into the proportion and likeness of virtue—such a man, ruling in a city of the same character, they have never yet seen, neither one nor many of them—do you think they ever did?'

ABBY LEACH.

Digitized by Google

II.—THE OCEAN IN SANSKRIT EPIC POETRY.

Touching on this point in a previous paper in the nineteenth volume of this Journal, I noticed that both the epics of India referred to "ships wrecked at sea." The question whether the great poet of the Rāmāyaṇa refers to the ocean resolves itself, to my mind, into the question whether the Rāmāyaṇa was written by the great poet to whom it is attributed or by another Homer with the same name. If it is admitted that we do not know which parts of the extant epic are genuine, then we have no means of determining whether to Vālmīki the ocean was "entirely unknown," and this factor in the discussion of the relative antiquity of the two epics is not important. If, on the other hand, we accept the parts of the epic unanimously recorded in the different versions of the text as the work of Vālmīki, then it is difficult to see why we should refuse to credit that sainted poet with a knowledge of the ocean.

Granting so much, however, I should myself restrict the probable expression of this knowledge to the cases (just mentioned) where the texts agree, and therefore conclude that, though Vālmīki shows acquaintance with the ocean and with ocean-phenomena, the descriptions in the extant epic have been multiplied by later imitators.

In this paper I refrain from further polemical discussion of the subject, my object being merely to give a picture of the ocean as described by both epics, by the epic attributed to Vālmīki, and by Vālmīki himself, in so far as a distinction is possible between the last two. Only in the case of two items I should like to add here a note to the matter of my former paper. First it is possible that the reason why Vālmīki employs the device of a dike to get the army across from India to Ceylon may be that given in the great epic at iii. 283, 28. As the numbers to be transported are here *asaṅkhyeya*, 'beyond computation,' çl. 9, it is said with some show of reason that "there are not ships enough," *nāvo na santi senāyā bahvyas tārayituṁ tathā*. This may be implied in G. (Gorresio) v. 92, 9, where the speaker recommends having recourse to Ocean's benevolence as the only means of transporting

Digitized by Google

the army, "considering that Rāma's army is so large," (*iti me vartate buddhiḥ*) *dṛṣṭvā Rāma-balam mahat*, which is not expressly put forward here in the alternate text, though both versions give numbers that suggest the same reason, crores and crores of soldiers being counted, the number running into quintillions and sexillions.[1] The second reason given in the Mahābhārata—that the confiscation for military purposes of all the ships and boats would be detrimental to trade (a course opposed to the policy of a wise ruler, *vaṇijām upaghātaṁ ca katham asmadvidhaç caret*, loc. cit.)—may be mentioned as a curiosity.

The second item to be added to the former paper is a query whether 'Nala's Bridge' is not a misnomer if we make a distinction between a bridge above and a dike in the water. "Whatever is put into the water I will hold together" or "The *setu* I will hold," *dhārayiṣyāmi*, R. vi. 22, 42; M. 283, 42, does not imply a bridge. The sea is in fact filled up rather than built over, *sāgaraṁ samapūrayan*, R. vi. 22, 53 (compare 'ocean filled with rocks,' vi. 30, 11, where the same verb), and the mass is bound together, *babandhuḥ*, G. v. 95, 17, with vines and creepers (so M. 148, 10). Hence *na viṣeduḥ* in the description of G. v. 95, 15 means not the peaks, rocks, trees, and rubbish, "did not sink," but that they "did not separate." *Setu*, as far as I know, is in both epics always a causeway or dike that forms a bridge only by appearing like a dam above the water, its usual purpose being, however, to prevent river-water from progressing. Thus the *setu* of law firm on its *maryādā* or bounding limit is a dike which causes the river of virtue to rise to full flood, xii. 299, 11. But in G. v. 76, 21, in just such an image of the sea, the same verb as that above is used: "By thee alone, being virtuous, this people running into lawlessness is restrained, *dhāryate*, as is the ocean by a dike," *setune 'va mahodadhiḥ*. It is then just the word to characterize the wall built by Nala from India to Ceylon, the rocks seen to-day being all there is left of the dike, which was originally raised to the surface and filled in (it was ten leagues wide and one hundred long) with rubbish of every sort. The river-dike is illustrated in a proverb found at xiii. 35, 20, where occurs the same word, implying that the dike holds:

açakyaṁ spraṣṭum ākāçam acālyo Himavān giriḥ
adhāryā setunā Gaṅgā durjayā brāhmaṇā bhuvi,

[1] Compare on these incredible and almost uncountable numbers, Weber, Ind. Streif. I, p. 97.

Digitized by Google

"As none can touch the upper air or move Himālaya's moveless dome,
Or Ganges' flood with dike restrain, so none a priest can overcome."[1]

That is, all restraint of Ganges would be a mere dike of sand, and *sīdanti sikatāsetavaḥ*, G. v. 88, 19, 'sand-dikes collapse' (v. l. *vāluka*°). Compare also the proverb, R. ii. 9, 54, *gatodake setubandho na kalyāṇi vidhīyate*, "'Tis no use, my lady, to build the dike when the water's gone" (implied, ib. 18, 23).

Common to both epics are the similes, derived from an older period, comparing armies in confusion with ships wrecked in a flood, tossed about by contrary winds, as in R. vi. 50, 1; v. 25, 14; M. ix. 3, 5; 4, 29; 19, 2. Another example may be found in R. v. 1, 177:

pratilomena vātena mahānāur iva sāgare,

compared with v. 28, 8:

mahārṇave nāur iva mūḍhavātā,

where the "great ship in the ocean distressed by contrary wind" is complementary to the "ship distressed in the great flood," and the two make it improbable that in v. 25, 14, the ship distressed "in mid-flood" is a boat on a river. Compare *hatanāuḥ sāgare yathā*, of a wrecked sailor swimming in the ocean, R. v. 37, 5.

An image of this sort in the Mahābhārata speaks of the ship being laden with pearls and hanging on the back of a leviathan, *makara*. As represented in the Rāmāyaṇa, Ocean (personified) rises from the depths "adorned with self-made pearls," R. vi. 22, 20, and the ordinary use of *ratna* as in this passage makes it probable that the ship laden with *ratna* is a vessel employed in the pearl-fishing business, especially as the ship is here described as "wrecked on the edge of the flood, and filled with pearls," *arṇavānte ratnābhipūrṇām makarasya pṛṣṭhe*, iii. 270, 19.

The leviathan here mentioned is known to both epics in the identical image of a hero plunging into the affray "like a *makara* into the ocean":

praviveça mahāsenām makaraḥ sāgaraṁ yathā, i. 138, 30,
kṣobhayanti sma tāṁ senām makaraḥ sāgaraṁ yathā, ix. 18, 10,

[1] Sky, mountain, river, and land are involved, *bhuvi* 'on earth' opposed to the river and mountain, as 'on land,' or among men.

Digitized by Google

(*sāinyam*) *praviveça mahābāhur makaraḥ sāgaraṁ yathā*, viii. 77, 10,

praviveça ripoḥ sāinyaṁ makaraḥ sāgaraṁ yathā, G. vi. 77, 6,

(*sāinyam*) *mahārṇavam mīna ivā 'viveça*, R. vi. 69, 67.

That these are sea-monsters is shown by Arjuna's description: "I beheld the ocean, *udadhi*, terrible, the lord of waters, *apām pati*, the inexhaustible . . . Thousands of pearl-laden ships, *timiṅgilas*, turtles, and *makaras* like hills sunk in water," M. iii. 169, 1–4. The image above appears as *timine 'va mahājalam* (a rare word) *kṣobhyamāṇam*, M. vi. 112, 34. But the *timi* is also in a pond, R. ii. 81, 16.

Yet the *makara* simile is in so far inconclusive as to fail in the passage corresponding to G. (Gorresio), where the Bombay has *pataṁga iva pāvakam*. But we learn at least that the 'lord of waters' is really ocean, and can scarcely doubt that the 'lord of waters,' where it occurs elsewhere as an epithet of *sāgara*, justifies us in rendering the latter word by 'ocean,' in fact the ocean of both epics. For the descriptions in detail are almost identical, and the flood is both portrayed as an ocean and differentiated from all rivers, especially the Ganges.

It is the bottomless flood, the same expression used in the Mahābhārata of ocean. It is measureless, also used of ocean in the other epic. It is the home of Varuṇa (the lord of monsters, as the other epic calls him). Moreover, it is the lord of all the streams, not as being chief among them, but as being the flood into which empty the great rivers. Furthermore, it is expressly salt.

Compare R. v. 19, 31 = 92, 8: *khanitaḥ Sagareṇā 'yam aprameyo mahodadhiḥ* (v. l. *mahārṇavaḥ*); ib. G. 6–7: *makarālayaḥ* and *varuṇālayaḥ*; ib. G. 94, 7: *sāgaraḥ saritām patiḥ*. The last is not in the alternate text, but in iv. 11, 8 = G. 9, 37, where *samudraṁ saritām patim* (= M. ix. 50, 15) is followed by *sāgaraṁ ratnasaṁcayam* (in G. *makarālayam*). R. has also the classical *saritpatir* (*vā 'nilacañcalormiḥ*), iv. 14, 23. The "terrible waves" of ocean are alluded to in R. iv. 53, 1:

tatas te dadṛçur ghoraṁ sāgaraṁ varuṇālayam
apāram abhigarjantaṁ ghorāir ūrmibhir ākulam
(G. 53, 2: *apāram iva . . . mahoraganiṣevitam*).

Compare vi. 42, 37: *vegā iva mahodadheḥ*. The epithets *varuṇ-*

Digitized by Google

ālaya (also M. iii. 282, 44, etc.) and *makarālaya* are common, and in R. vi. 123, 17, *lavaṇārṇava*, 'the salt flood,' as a substitute for the latter (G. 108, 15; the next verses may be compared with the last citation). The passages G. v. 9, 1 and 15, 23, containing *makarālaya*, are not in the alternate text, but the word occurs there in v. 36, 8; vi. 22, 70, though it belongs rather to G. and Mbh.[1]; compare G. v. 92, 6 = vi. 19, 28. G. v. 3, 38 = iv. 67, 13 has *varuṇālaya*, but G. v. 5, 2, where it occurs, is lacking in the ed. Bombay.

The only difference between *arṇava* and *sāgara* is that the former is less precisely ocean, but rather flood:

yena datta mahī sarvā sasāgaravanārṇavā, G. vi. 41, 15.

The flood's bottomless depth and "noise like a tempest" is described: *agādha* (as in M. ix. 3, 5), *gambhīra*, v. 6, 13 = G. 12, 24:

samudram iva gambhīram samudrasamaniḥçvanam,

where G. has *parjanyam iva*. Compare *agādhaṁ varuṇālayam*, G. v. 34, 3; *paramagādho 'yaṁ sāgaraḥ saritām patiḥ* (*varuṇāvāsaḥ*, 28), ib. 74, 17.

As in the Mahābhārata, the Ganges is *sāgaraṁgamā* or *sāgaragāminī*, R. ii. 52, 3 = G. 49, 3. The ocean is the receptacle of all rivers: *sāinyaṁ viveça sindhus tu yathā 'rṇavāugham; çrotāṁsi pratijagrāha nadīnām iva sāgaraḥ*, G. iii. 31, 11 (with v. l. *nadyoghān*, 25, 13). Compare also *nadanadīpati*, an epithet of ocean common to both epics, R. v. 16, 12; G. v. 66, 34; R. vi. 22, 59; M. passim.[2] Even Gomatī and Jumna are included, R. ii. 49, 10; 105, 19.

The coast so often alluded to is one on salt water: *na çakyate vārayitum vele 'va lavaṇāmbhasā*, G. iii. 28, 2 (v. l. *dhārayituṁ lavaṇāmbha 'ivo 'lbaṇam*, 22, 2). The phraseology is here similar in both epics,[3] one can not pass over or overcome:

[1] Compare *varuṇo yādasām patiḥ*, M. ix. 47, 10, and *sāgarālaya*, vs. 9; *makarālaya* and *saritām patiḥ*, vs. 7.

[2] iii. 283, 36, for example. The ocean is here a *sindhu*, vs. 25. The phrase 'lord of rivers' occurs at times in G. when not in the Bombay text (thus in iii. 60, 18; v. 3, 79; vi. 108, 13), but it occurs elsewhere in the other text—above, and, e. g., vi. 22, 40; 87, 2; 103, 40 (*samudraḥ*), etc.

[3] Compare also *saritāṁ sāgaro bhartā mahāvelām ivormimān* (Çānti); *velāvanam* (v. l. *balam*) *samāsādya*, M. iii. 283, 22; *vele' va sāgaram*, ib. vii. 25, 14; *vele 'va makarālayam* and *saritām patim*, ib. vi. 108, 60 and vii. 16, 21.

Digitized by Google

velām ivā 'sādya yathā samudraḥ, R. vi. 109, 21 (compare ii. 23, 29).
velāṁ samāsādya yathā samudraḥ, G. ib. 93, 28.
velāṁ iva samāsādya, M. i. 227, 28.
velām iva mahodadhiḥ, R. vi. 118, 16 (also 76, 63 and G. ii. 30, 30).
velām iva mahormayaḥ (v. l. *mahodadhiḥ*), G. vi. 55, 58 = 76, 63.

Otherwise in G. v. 87, 7: *çuçubhe . . . nivṛttavelaḥ samaye* (as in vi. 42, 37, above) *prasanna iva sāgaraḥ*. The *sāgarāmbarā vasumatī* of M. i. 170, 78 is found in R. as *mahī sāgarāmbarā*, and the *samudrāntā pṛthivī* of M. vii. 198, 55; xiii. 62, 66, may be copied in the *saptasamudrāntā mahī*, G. iv. 15, 8 (iii. 78, 4).

"Like a second ocean" describes a flood of people: *agādhaç cā 'prameyaç ca dvitīya iva sāgaraḥ*,[1] R. vi. 20, 4. "Like another ocean" is a common comparison, e. g. R. vi. 4, 104; 26, 41. When more are recognized they are referred to either as (above) "the seven seas" or as four seas in number, as in R. v. 49, 12:

kṛtsnam parivṛtaṁ lokaṁ caturbhir iva sāgarāiḥ,

or as "the south, west, north, and another," *itara*, G. vi. 112, 65 ff., the fifth ocean serving as a means of comparison, G. v. 17, 7:

dvitīyam iva cā 'kāçam . . . pañcamaṁ sāgaraṁ yathā.

The sea covers the (seven) *pātālas*, R. vi. 22, 1:

adyā 'haṁ çoṣayiṣyāmi sapātālam mahārṇavam.

The ship *nāus* (also *plava*) that sails the sea is distinguished from the river-boat, *nāukā*, but, like it, must have been worked by a *yantra*, probably tackle implying a sail, though oars would answer to so general a word, which means no more than machine or machinery of any sort. Curiously enough, there is no distinct mention of sails, *paṭa*, *vātapaṭa*, such as are spoken of in later literature, though *vāhana* may include sail, R. ii. 52, 6 (81, *sphya* = rudder).

As this paper is descriptive rather than argumentative, I will not apologize for pausing here to notice an odd mistake in printing M. vii. 141, where Karṇa is addressed with the words

na vinā nāyakaṁ senā muhūrtam api tiṣṭhati
āhaveṣv, āhavaçreṣṭha, Karṇa, hīne 'va nāur jale,

[1] Compare M. iii. 283, 22: *dvitīyasāgaraṁbhaṁ tad balam*, of the same army; but also M. ix. 30, 55: *dvitīyam iva sāgaram*, etc. Both epics have *sāgarāntā* as an epithet of earth 'bordered by ocean,' 'bordered by seven seas,' in G.; but in R. iii. 75, 4 the alternate text also alludes to seven seas.

Digitized by Google

where B. 5, 8 has *netṛhīneva*. The original is doubtless to be found in G. vi. 23, 30:

hatapravīrā vidhvastā nirutsāhā nirudyamā
senā bhavati saṁgrāme hatakarṇe 'va nāur jale.

Here the Bombay has *senā bhramati saṁkhyeṣu*, like M. vi. 118, 7: (*pāṇḍusenā*) *bhrāmyate bahudhā rājan mārutene 'va nāur jale*. Compare also R. ii. 81, 6: *paribhramati rājaçrīr nāur ivā 'karṇikā jale*, where G. 82, 6 has *akarṇā nāur ivā 'mbhasi*.

The Mahābhārata recognizes that the tides of ocean rise higher with the (full) moon, as in ix. 26, 28:

Bhīmaḥ saṁcukṣubhe kruddhaḥ parvaṇī 'va mahodadhiḥ.

Not only does the Rāmāyaṇa refer to the same fact, but its descriptions are so clearly based on observation, they are so vivid and strong, that it seems as impossible to deny to the poet of the poem all knowledge of ocean from this one point of view alone, as to imagine that πολυφλοισβοῖο θαλάσσης was the description of a riparian poet. When, too, it is remembered that the ocean here plainly named is elsewhere the "salt flood," it is clear that no Ganges is meant in the *udayaḥ sāgarasya parvakāle*, G. iv. 34, 32, with which, as in the quotation above from the Mahābhārata, the anger of a hero is compared. Sometimes only the "waxing ocean" is mentioned, but parallel passages show that the connotation is the same. Thus, *çuçrāva tumulaṁ çabdaṁ sāgarasye 'va vardhataḥ*, G. ii. 105, 57, compared with ib. v. 3, 3:

yathā candramaso vṛddhyā pūryate sāgaro 'mbhasā
vavṛdhe stūyamānasya tathā vīryaṁ Hanūmataḥ.

"Then waxed Hanūman's strength at that applause
As ocean fills at waxing of the moon."

Then is ocean most beautiful: *açobhata mahāvegaḥ parvaṇī 'va jalāçayaḥ* (v. l. *sāgarasye 'va parvaṇi*, G. ii. 87, 5 = 80, 4), "fair as the sea at moon-turn." The ocean 'rejoices' at this time: *bhaviṣyati purī hṛṣṭā* (v. l. *nandiṣyati*) *samudra iva parvaṇi*, R. ii. 43, 11 = G. 42, 13. It becomes 'more agitated': *babhūva saṁkṣubdhataraḥ* (v. l. *saṁrabdhataraḥ*) *samudra iva parvaṇi*, R. ii. 18, 7 (15, 9).

Whether the one recension has not enlarged on the theme is a fair question, although enough remains in the other (Bombay) text to show that the idea was familiar to its writer. Something

Digitized by Google

of the same relation as that already mentioned is found here—namely, the first three citations given above are found only in G., and where here in ii. 11, 18[b] stands

pūrṇacandrodaye pūrṇo vardhate sāgaro yathā,
"As ocean fills when the full moon arises,"

the alternate text, 14, 47[a], has

yathā nandati tejasvī sāgaro bhāskarodaye.
"As glorious ocean joys when the sun arises."

It is true that the sea is inaccurately described (as containing lotuses, alligators and frogs), but the last passage, as Professor Jacobi has said, is probably a late interpolation and the former are conventional. Some descriptive verses have been furnished by the author of Das Rāmāyaṇa, as at p. 123 (and preceding):

ambaram sāgaram co 'bhāu nirviçeṣam apaçyata
sampṛktam nabhasā hy ambhaḥ sampṛktaṁ ca nabho 'mbhasā,

where the commingling of cloud and sea is rather well described, as before, vi. 4, 120–21, is given the sound of the breaking surges:

bhrāntormijāla saṁnādam pralolam iva sāgaram,

though less effective is the simile in vs. 118 or G. v. 74, 37:

ūrmayaḥ sindhurājasya mahābherya ivā 'hatāḥ,

where the waves beat like cymbals. The following I add chiefly as an illustration of the descriptive style of a poet who followed Vālmīki, G. vi. 14, 25:

(As the sun set and night advanced, *pūrṇacandrapradīpā ca yāminī samavartata*)
sacandragrahanakṣatraṁ nabho 'dṛçyata sāgare
dvitīyam iva cā 'kāçaṁ sacandragrahatārakam.

The alternate text stops with °*pradīptā ca kṣapā samativartata*, 38, 13.

I have already given examples of the tumult of people compared with the roaring of ocean. Another case, only in G. v. 9, 49, has a verse descriptive of the tumult of a town:

sāgaropamanirghoṣāṁ sāgarānilasevitām,

where at least the first half seems to betray some ability in fitting

Digitized by Google

the word to its object.[1] But no copy of nature in any epic poetry surpasses the splendid description of the flood of people whose uproar in R. ii. 6, 27 = G. 5, 27, is rendered in the magnificent verse

parvasū 'dīrṇavegasya sāgarasye 'va niḥsvanaḥ,

where the swell and filling and very hiss of the ocean are reflected in the simile of the high-surging billows.

This brief account of epic descriptions shows that the Rāmāyaṇa and Mahābhārata employ much the same matter in similes and allusions to the ocean; that one text of the Rāmāyaṇa has rather more such matter than the other; but that both texts, taken together, indicate that the water-similes and descriptions of flood-water refer to ocean. It is the general ocean into which empty the Ganges and Indus and all other rivers, as is stated above from one text, and more explicitly in the other, R. vi. 22, 22:

Gaṅgāsindhupradhānābhir āpagābhiḥ samāvṛtaḥ
sāgaraḥ.

"That ocean which the Ganges and the Indus
And lesser rivers fill."

WASHBURN HOPKINS.

[1] Sea-similes of this sort (apparently) occur frequently, but most of them are not very successful. Compare G. vi. 16, 49 ff., a string of them; v. 74, 14; vi. 19, 20; 99, 25, etc.

Digitized by Google

III.—THE GREEK IN CICERO'S EPISTLES.

The use of Greek by Cicero represents two phases of the influence of the Greeks upon the Romans: the natural utilization of a small part of the Greek vocabulary, and the free use of Greek in the social intercourse of the day. When the Romans came in contact with the higher artistic development of the Greeks, they were content to adopt Greek forms of presentation, and thus Roman literature became, so far as it was original, the embodiment of Roman thought fashioned according to Grecian models. Along with the adoption of the forms of presentation came the admission of Greek words to a place in the Roman vocabulary, and the naturalization process was carried on somewhat freely, Saalfeld (Tensaurus Italograecus) giving about eight thousand words borrowed entire, or in which some part is derived from the Greek.

This introduction of Greek terms was not in all respects a loss to the borrower, as it gave to Roman philosophers, physicians and rhetoricians the same technical vocabulary as was used by the Greeks, and enabled them to deal with like objects and like phases of thought in terms common to both languages. Cicero says, Acad. Post. 1, 7, 25 Nos vero, inquit Atticus; quin etiam Graecis licebit utare, cum voles, si te Latina forte deficient. Bene sane facis; sed enitar, ut Latine loquar, nisi in huiusce modi verbis, ut philosophiam, aut rhetoricam aut physicam aut dialecticam appellem, quibus ut aliis multis consuetudo iam utitur pro Latinis. The borrowing, as indicated by Cicero, was not altogether to facilitate discussion of kindred subjects, but also because the Romans felt the deficiencies in their own language. Cicero occasionally speaks of these, e. g. de Fin. 2, 4, 13 et quidem saepe quaerimus verbum Latinum par Graeco, et quod idem valeat; 3, 4, 15 et tamen puto concedi nobis oportere, ut Graeco verbo utamur, si quando minus occurret Latinum, ne hoc ephippiis et acratophoris potius quam proegmenis et apoproegmenis concedatur; quamquam haec quidem praeposita recte et reiecta dicere licebit; 3, 15, 51 cum uteretur in lingua copiosa factis tamen nominibus ac novis, quod nobis in hac inopi lingua non conceditur; quamquam tu hanc copiosiorem etiam soles dicere.

Digitized by Google

The last view is repeated de Fin. 1, 3, 10 sed ita sentio et saepe disserui, Latinam linguam non modo *non* inopem, ut vulgo putarent, sed locupletiorem etiam esse quam Graecam. Quando enim nobis, vel dicam aut oratoribus bonis aut poetis, postea quidem quam fuit, quem imitarentur, ullus orationis vel copiosae vel elegantis ornatus defuit? 3, 2, 5 non modo non vinci a Graecis verborum copia, sed in ea etiam superiores. (Cf. Tusc. Disp. 2, 15, 35; 3, 5, 10–11; 3, 10, 23.) However, his views on this question seem to have varied with his moods, for elsewhere he asserts the opposite; e. g. ad Fam. 9, 26, 2, where, after translating a Greek statement, he adds: (Graece hoc melius; tu, si voles, interpretabere).

Munro, Lucretius, vol. II[4], p. 11, supports Cicero's favorable view of the Latin: "Whatever Greek writer Cicero wishes to explain, he can find adequate Latin terms to express the Greek, even if they are those of Plato or Aristotle... Had Cicero chosen to apply the prolific energy of his intellect to the task, he might have invented and wedded to beautiful language as copious a terminology as was afterwards devised by the efforts of Tertullian and the other fathers, Aquinas and the other schoolmen." This is in criticism of the passages (1, 136; 830; 3, 260) in which Lucretius bewails the "egestas patrii sermonis"; and the spirit of his lamentations is reflected by others. Livy 27, 11, 5 calls attention to the greater facility of the Greek in the formation of compound words. Vitruvius de Architectura 5, 4, 1 denies the completeness of the Latin technical vocabulary: Harmonia autem est musica literatura obscura et difficilis, maxime quidem quibus Graecae litterae non sunt notae, quam si volumus explicare, necesse est Graecis verbis uti, quod nonnulla eorum Latinas non habent appellationes. Seneca, Ep. 58, 7, mentions *angustias Romanas*, and it was the same as late as the time of St. Augustine, who says, C. D. 10, 1: uno verbo significandum, quoniam mihi satis idoneum non occurrit Latinum, Graeco ubi necesse est insinuo quid velim dicere. (Cf. 7, 1; 12, 2.) But such considerations affect chiefly the rhetorical and philosophical works of Cicero, in which there are 277 Greek words, and six in the orations against Verres (Loew, Quaestiones de Graecorum verborum quae in epistulis Ciceronis exstant, fontibus, usu, condicionibus, p. 9). In the Epistles there are a considerable number of Greek words which were afterwards fully naturalized and freely used as Latin words. Only a part of these need be given: *alle-*

Digitized by Google

goria, apologismus, apotheosis, archetypum, autochthon, authenticus, blasphema, catholicus, character, diaeresis, diarrhoea, dysenteria, emetica, eulogia, exotericus, hypostasis, hypotheca, mysticus, palingenesia, parrhesia, phantasia, problema, sympathia, symposium, syntaxis, technologia, topothesia, zetema, zelotypia.

The Epistles of Cicero illustrate the genial as well as the vain side of his character, and are an index of a certain phase of Roman social intercourse not revealed in other forms of literary presentation. They illustrate Grecian politeness rather than Roman urbanity, as Greek was a recognized part of current society talk. The close intimacy of Cicero with Atticus furnished the ground for its use in the letters which passed between them, while its absence from the epistles most deeply serious indicates that it was considered appropriate for the expression of the lighter veins of thought. Yet the use of Greek quotations was compatible with a most dignified address, as is shown by the epistle to Caesar, ad Fam. 13, 15, crowded with Greek quotations, and closing with the words: genere novo sum litterarum ad te usus, ut intellegeres non vulgarem esse commendationem. In some of the other epistles Greek is used to express conventional compliments, e. g. ad Fam. 2, 8 (to Caelius) πολιτικώτερον enim te adhuc neminem cognovi; 9, 3, 2 (to Varro) sed quid ego nunc haec ad te, cuius domi nascuntur, γλαῦκ' εἰς Ἀθήνας; 10, 13, 2 (to Plancus); 11, 25, 2 (to Brutus) non imitor λακωνισμὸν tuum, though in the same epistle he has brevitatem secutus sum te magistro. 7, 32 (to Volumnius) is in a tone of polite banter, while in 7, 26 (to Gallus); 14, 7 (to Terentia), and 16, 18 (to Tiro) Greek medical terms are used.

The deliberate judgment of Cicero in regard to the use of language is laid down de Off. 1, 31, 111 sermone eo debemus uti, qui innatus est nobis, ne, ut quidam, Graeca verba inculcantes iure optimo rideamur. The freedom allowable in epistles gave him an opportunity to disregard his own advice, and his vanity, working under the conditions of a friendly, unrestrained correspondence, must be reckoned as one of the reasons for the free use of the Greek. Handling the Greek freely, he toyed with the Latin also, as ad 1, 16, 13[1] quare, ut opinor, φιλοσοφητέον, id quod tu facis, et istos consulatus non flocci facteon, 'So I suppose one must play the philosopher, the thing that you are at, and not hold those consulships worth a straw.'

[1] The references to the Epp. ad Att. do not name the collection.

Digitized by Google

Greek occurs in the Epistles in about 850 passages, nearly all in the epistles to Atticus. In the Epp. ad Fam., Greek is used by Cicero as well as by his correspondents. In Book XIV he has but one Greek expression: χολὴν ἄκρατον noctu eieci, 7, 1. The Epp. Quint. Frat. closely resemble these, while in those to Brutus there is but one Greek word (1, 1, 1), ἐμφατικώτερον, which occurs again in Gellius 13, 29, 4; and Serv. ad Verg. A. 10, 331, showing that it had not yet been naturalized. In a few epistles the use of the Greek is especially noticeable. 6, 5 and 6 were written in Greek as a precaution against his thought becoming known to any other than Atticus, a possibility to which he frequently refers. Both epistles refer to Philotimus the freedman of Cicero, and in them he uses several rare and poetic words, and some found nowhere else. 9, 4 contains an exercise in Greek prose composition written, partly as a diversion, at Formiae in 49 B. C., and containing ten of the sixteen verbals in -τέον found in the Epistles. 2, 9, 4; 2, 12, 4; and 2, 15, 4 contain the greetings of the little Cicero, or of the philosopher Cicero, to Atticus the Athenian. Ad Fam. 15, 16–18 Cicero discusses philosophy with Cassius, and in reply receives a letter (19) containing more Greek than his own.

As is shown by this, there could be no criticism of Cicero by his correspondents for his use of Greek, and they must be included with Cicero in a general discussion of the subject. None of the epistles of Atticus have come down to us, but we can tell something of their general character, as Cicero quotes from them, or else alludes to words in them. In at least forty passages there are direct quotations of Greek; e. g. 9, 11, 2 quam illam νέκυιαν, ut tu appellas, timere! 9, 10, 7; 9, 18, 2. 14, 11, 1 Ἀκολασίαν istorum scribis. 16, 7, 3 bene igitur tu, qui εὐθανασίαν bene! In other letters quotations are made from the words of friends; e. g. 9, 15, 4; 10, 1, 1.

Though Cicero's use of Greek was justified by the prevailing communicational forms of the day, yet, apart from the use of direct quotations, it may be considered, (1) partly as a mere display of a knowledge of Greek, (2) partly as an attempt to make up for some of the deficiencies of the Latin language by the use of a word afterwards fully naturalized, or of a substitute for some form not so well developed in Latin as in Greek.

1. Though Cicero sometimes uses Greek words which are not to be found in any extant Greek work, and this may seem to

Digitized by Google

indicate an undue freedom in the use of the Greek, yet if we had the mass of the writings of the New Comedy and of the vocabulary current in Athens at the time of Cicero, we should probably have all the Greek words used in the Epistles. The language of comedy and free epistles is akin, and from the plays of Plautus especially we can infer something as to the freedom of expression in Greek comedy, and Roman comic wit had some Greek phrases at its command. Bearing these facts in mind, we may safely assume that there is little or no originality in the Greek of the Epistles, excepting, perhaps, where Cicero has formed punning Greek adjectives and nouns from the names of men.

2. Reference has already been made to the use of words afterwards naturalized. Two other features are worthy of notice—the large number of adjectives derived from verbs, and the number of compounds. About one third of the adjectives are derived from verbs, and two thirds of these end in *-ros*. Still more noticeable is the large number of compounds used. The weakness of the Latin in word-formation was recognized by the Romans themselves. Livy 27, 11, 5 calls attention to the fact as the reason for the use of a Greek word transliterated: quos androgynos vulgus, ut pleraque, faciliore ad duplicanda verba Graeco sermone appellat. Exclusive of passages which may be assigned to definite authors, and proverbial expressions, there are in the Epistles 685 words—adjectives, adverbs, nouns and verbs. Of this number 41 per cent. are simple terms. Negative terms with *ἀ-* are common, while there is little difference in prepositional formations. Though there was no necessity for the use of the Greek, yet, given the basis of social propriety, Cicero gained somewhat in conciseness from the use of the Greek. See Boltzenthal, De Graeci sermonis proprietatibus, quae in Ciceronis epistolis inveniuntur, p. 7.

Views of Tyrrell.

The character of a part of the Greek used by Cicero has been presented by Tyrrell, Correspondence of Cicero, vol. I², pp. 66–8, under the following heads:

1. In many cases the Latin actually wants a word, and borrows from the Greek, while we, to supply a like lacuna, have recourse to the French, e. g. *ἀκηδία* 'ennui.'

2. In certain cases the Greek answers rather to our slang or cant phrases, e. g. *ἄμορφον* 'bad form.'

Digitized by Google

3. Cicero often borrows a Greek proverb where we have recourse to the Latin, e. g. οὐχ ὁσίη φθιμένοισιν for 'de mortuis nil nisi bonum.'

The use of Greek by Cicero may be compared with the use of French by English-speaking people, but the translation of the Greek by slang phrases may put too much modern feeling into ancient thought. At any rate, translation is a matter of interpretation which must vary with different interpreters, and must depend on one's view of the mental state of Cicero at the time of writing. Prof. Tyrrell translates ἐκτένεια 'gush,' yet Paul uses the word in all seriousness, Acts 26, 7, and the interpretation for Cicero must be between the high seriousness of Paul and the possibilities of a slangy translation.

The use of Greek expressions for whose equivalent we have recourse to the Latin, at certain points, illustrates a development of the Latin later than the time of Cicero. He uses κατὰ μέτρον and κατὰ λεπτόν instead of *seriatim*, which is found once in late Latin. 'Ne sutor supra crepidam' is given by Pliny, N. H. 35, 10 (36), 85 ne supra crepidam sutor iudicaret, quod et ipsum in proverbium abiit. This is evidently a translation of the Greek, as is the statement Val. Max. 8, 12, Ext. 3 supra plantam ascendere vetuit. These indicate that the proverb was still regarded as distinctly Greek, and that the translated form had not yet become fixed. 'Lapsus memoriae,' 'de mortuis nil nisi bonum,' and 'audi alteram partem' seem to postdate Cicero. ζώσης φωνῆς, 2, 12, 2, is in a quasi quotation. *Viva voce*, though freely used later, is conjectural for Cicero, de Agr. 2, 2, 2, and Cael. 22, 55. Σῶμα occurs 2, 1, 3, while *corpus* is used Quint. Frat. 2, 11, 3, and ad Fam. 5, 12, 4. *Muta persona* is used once by Cicero, de Dom. 52, 134.

QUOTATIONS.

One important consideration in discussing Cicero's use of Greek quotations is the fact that Roman literature had not been sufficiently developed to furnish a mass of original quotable material in any way comparable to that furnished by the Greek. Starting with translations, and advancing through imitation, some of the best quotable material in Latin literature was in reality foreign, and even if quoted in translated form, would have smacked of the alien. Bearing this in mind, it can readily be seen why, under the existing social and literary conditions, in writing to those who

Digitized by Google

were themselves familiar with the Greek, Cicero should have resorted to that language for quotations in full, or for parts of lines suggestive of an entire picture.

Although Cicero made free use of Greek, he frankly admits a feeling of uncertainty as to its highest literary finish: 1, 19, 10 Commentarium consulatus mei Graece compositum misi ad te, in quo si quid erit, quod homini Attico minus Graecum eruditumque videatur, non dicam, quod tibi, ut opinor, Panhormi Lucullus de suis historiis dixerat, se, quo facilius illas probaret Romani hominis esse, idcirco barbara quaedam et soloeca dispersisse; apud me si quid erit eius modi, me imprudente erit et invito. A slip of memory is perhaps the reason for the mistake ad Fam. 10, 13, 2 itaque Homerus non Aiacem nec Achillem sed Ulixem appellavit πτολιπόρθιον. His memory may have been at fault sometimes in quoting, but variations from the accepted text are rather to be considered as changes purposely made. Proverbs are quoted freely, and Cicero's putting does not always correspond with that found elsewhere; e. g. 4, 7, 2 de Metello οὐχ ὁσίη φθιμένοισιν for κταμένοισιν, Hom. Od. 22, 412. Pliny, Ep. 9, 1, 3, uses the same form as Cicero, and the participle used is the prevailing one in lyric poetry. It may be that the proverb had come to the Romans, not from the Epic, but from another source, in which κταμένοισιν had been displaced by φθιμένοισιν. Ad Fam. 13, 15, 2 (to Caesar), he quotes Hom. Il. 6, 208:

αἰὲν ἀριστεύειν καὶ ὑπείροχον ἔμμεναι ἄλλων,

while ad Quint. Frat. 3, 5, 4 πολλὸν is given for αἰὲν. Ad 8, 8, 2 is quoted Aristoph. Achar. 659 slightly varied from the text:

πρὸς ταῦθ' ὅ τι χρή, καὶ παλαμάσθων
καὶ πάντ' ἐπ' ἐμοὶ τεκταινέσθων·
τὸ γὰρ εὖ μετ' ἐμοῦ.

With this may be placed 7, 3, 5 ut scribis

ποῦ σκάφος τὸ τῶν Ἀτρειδῶν;

which is assigned by some to an unknown author, or considered as a mistake in quotation. It may be considered as an adaptation of Eur. Troad. 455:

ποῦ σκάφος τὸ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ;

the change perhaps being made so as to refer to the Roman consuls.

Digitized by Google

In the case of certain Greek phrases used by Cicero it is not possible to determine whether he had in mind any special Greek author. While they may be definitely located, they seem rather to have been part of current Greek expression, circulating freely on their own merits, and not carrying with them any suggestion as to the source from which they came. This is especially true of certain proverbial statements which perhaps ought to be assigned to 'Proverbs' rather than to individual authors. Ad 16, 11, 1, Cicero mentions παῖδες παίδων. Verg. A. 3, 98 has *nati natorum*, and the MS D adds to the comment of Servius ad loc.: Graecus vero versus hic est (Il. 20, 308)

καὶ παίδων παῖδες, τοί κεν μετόπισθε γένωνται.

Tyrtaeus 7, 30 has the same expression as Cicero, and it also occurs elsewhere; e. g. in Pomtow, vol. II, p. 362, 6, 3; p. 364, 12, 4; Polyb. 4, 35, 15. Ad 14, 10, 1 Itaque γῆν πρὸ γῆς cogito. The acc. γῆν was probably in the original, as in Aeschylus, Prom. Vinct. 683, and Aristoph. Achar. 223. Ad 15, 4, 1 is used a proverb which forms part of a line in Euripides, Medea 410:

ἄνω ποταμῶν [ἱερῶν χωροῦσι παγαί],

and if the memory of Hesychius was not at fault, the proverb was used also by Aeschylus. Cf. Paroem. Gr. I 47, Z 2, 56. Ovid imitates the thought, Her. 5, 30:

ad fontem Xanthi versa recurret aqua.

Here also may be placed τῶν προὔργου τι 9, 4, 3 (Aristoph. Eccl. 784; Plutus 623; Thucyd. 4, 17, 2), and σύνες, ὅ τοι λέγω, the reading of Cobet for CINECΩTΘIΛETΩ, 10, 10, 3, where σὺν θεῷ τοι λέγω is usually given. See Pindar, Frag. 105, Bergk; Plato, Phaedr. 236 D; Meno 76 D; and Aristoph. Birds 945.

A. Poets.

Homer.—Counting as Homeric all quotations that can be traced to Homer, there are forty-five in all, in fifty-six passages, from forty-five different epistles. There are about twice as many from the Iliad as from the Odyssey, but exactness of statement is not possible, owing to the occurrence of the same quotations in both works. Of the forty-five, nineteen are less than a line in length, and were seemingly quoted merely as a key to the thought which Cicero wished to bring before the mind of the reader. Two or three words might bring up an entire Homeric picture. The

Digitized by Google

opinion of Pompey and of the other political Mrs. Grundys of the day seems to have affected Cicero greatly, for ad 2, 5, 11; 7, 1, 4; 7, 12, 3; 8, 16, 2; 13, 13, 2; 13, 24, 1, he quotes all or part of Il. 6, 442:

αἰδέομαι Τρῶας καὶ Τρῳάδας ἑλκεσιπέπλους.

See 7, 1, 4 αἰδέομαι non Pompeium modo, sed Τρῶας καὶ Τρῳάδας. 2, 16, 4, referring to a letter of his brother's, he says: πρόσθε λέων, ὄπιθεν δὲ . . . (Il. 6, 181). 4, 7, 4 he shows his charity for Metellus in the words οὐχ ὁσίη φθιμένοισιν. His letter to Atticus, 6, 1, 22, is not χρύσεα χαλκείων (Il. 6, 236). Ad Quint. Frat. 3, 9, and 9, 9, 3 he prays τότε μοι χάνοι εὐρεῖα χθών! (Il. 4, 182). 9, 6, 6 he compliments Atticus, and ad Fam. 9, 7, 1 Varro, by quoting part of a line (Il. 10, 224) referring to Diomede and Ulysses, σύν τε δύ ἐρχομένω. Ad 15, 5, 6 Atticus writes μετ' ἀμύμονα (Il. 2, 674), and Cicero improves the opportunity to apply the words to Atticus. Ad 9, 15, 3 Cicero apparently quotes from Atticus Τέτλαθι. Κύντερον (Od. 20, 18). Other short quotations are of the same general character, and are found 1, 1, 4 (Il. 22, 159); 1, 15, 1 (Il. 22, 268); 4, 7, 3 (Od. 1, 271; 305); 4, 15, 7 (Il. 23, 326); 6, 5, 2 (Il. 2, 298); 7, 6, 2 (Od. 12, 209); 7, 8, 4 (Il. 18, 309); 16, 6, 1; 16, 13a, 1 (Od. 3, 169; 16, 13a, 1, parts of vv. 171 and 172); ad Fam. 13, 15, 2 (Il. 1, 343); Quint. Frat. 1, 2, 2 (Od. 9, 513); 3, 9, 2 (Od. 9, 350).

Hesiod.—13, 12, 3 Cicero writes ego autem me parabam ad id quod ille mihi misisset, ut αὐτῷ τῷ μέτρῳ καὶ λώϊον si modo potuissem. Nam hoc etiam Hesiodus ascribit, αἴ κε δύνηαι. A translation is given of this Brutus 15, and de Off. 1, 15, 48 si ea quae utenda acceperis, maiore mensura, si modo possis, iubet reddere Hesiodus. A second quotation is part of some familiar advice ad Fam. 6, 18, 5 Lepta suavissimus ediscat Hesiodum et habeat in ore τῆς δ' ἀρετῆς ἱδρῶτα et cetera. The Greek is found also in Plato, Rep. 2, 364 D.

Pindar.—Ad 12, 5, 1 Cicero repeats ἄμπνευμα σεμνὸν Ἀλφειοῦ (Nem. 1, 1) from Atticus. 13, 38, 2 (a part repeated 13, 41) he has two quotations from Pindar, the first also quoted by Plato, Rep. 2, 365 B, nunc me iuva, mi Attice, consilio πότερον δίκᾳ τείχος ὕψιον . . . ἢ σκολιαῖς ἀπάταις. Ut enim Pindaro, sic δίχα μοι νόος ἀτρέκειαν εἰπεῖν.

Aeschylus.—There are two allusions to or adaptations of the words of Aeschylus: Quint. Frat. 1, 2, 13 evidently repeats a

Digitized by Google

quotation by Atticus: Cetera fuerunt in eadem epistola graviora, quam vellem, ὀρθὰν τὰν ναῦν et ἅπαξ θανεῖν. The first of this resembles part of a quotation assigned by Stobaeus, Flor. 108, 82 end, to Teles, while the latter part abbreviates Aes. Prom. Vinct. 769 εἰσάπαξ θανεῖν. This, however, may have been a common expression; cf. Herod. 7, 46 ἅπαξ τεθνάναι. The same sentiment is set forth 7, 20, 2 καὶ συναποθανεῖν. Sen. Ep. 85, 33 evidently translates Teles: Neptune, numquam hanc navem nisi rectam [videbis]. Quint. Frat. 3, 4, 6 is given a characterization of Q. Scaevola Ἄρη πνέων, modelled after Agam. 375–6 Ἄρη πνεόντων. Cf. 14, 10, 1.

Sophocles.—The most interesting of the passages from Sophocles is ad 2, 7, 4, where, after expressing a desire to see from the shore the shipwreck of his enemies, he adds the further wish,

κἂν ὑπὸ στέγῃ
πυκνῆς ἀκούειν ψακάδος εὐδούσῃ φρενί.

This is also quoted by Stobaeus, Flor. 59, 12; Nauck, Frag. 579. This passage seems to have been in the mind of Lucretius when he began his second book. See Munro ad Lucr. 2, 1. Pompey is described by two lines 2, 16, 2, and there is another passage in a quotation from Atticus 4, 8, 1:

μήπω μέγ' εἴπῃς, πρὶν τελευτήσαντ' ἴδῃς,

quoted by Stobaeus, Flor. 105, 21, from the Tereus of Sophocles, and a part is added to the comment by Servius ad Verg. A. 10, 547: "μὴ μέγ' εἴπῃς. Cf. Ajax 386 μηδὲν μέγ' εἴπῃς," and the parody Paroem. Gr. II 524, Apost. 11, 36:

μὴ σπεῦδε γῆμαι πρὶν τελευτήσαντ' ἴδῃς.

Ad 15, 11, 3 a line is quoted, and the first part of it again 16, 6, 2:

ἦ δεῦρ' ὁδός σοι τί δύναται νῦν, θεοπρόπε;

This is assigned by some to Sophocles. See Meineke 4, 610, xxxiii; Nauck, Adesp. 106.

Aristophanes.—The best known quotation (5, 10, 3) from Aristophanes is the beginning of Vesp. 1431:

ἔρδοι τις [ἣν ἕκαστος εἰδείη τέχνην].

('Let each one peg away at the craft which he knows best.') Cicero gives a closer translation Tusc. Disp. 1, 18, 41 bene enim illo Graecorum proverbio praecipitur quam quisque norit artem

Digitized by Google

in hac se exerceat. Another passage is given 8, 8, 2 (see p. 393), and 6, 1, 8 he repeats τὸ γὰρ εὖ μετ' ἐμοῦ.

Euripides.—Some of the quotations which may be assigned to Euripides are short, and may have become commonplaces. In this list may be placed (Hipp. 436) δευτέρας φροντίδας, Quint. Frat. 3, 1, 18; ἄνω ποταμῶν, 15, 4, 1; and perhaps Σπάρταν ἔλαχες, ταύταν κόσμει, 4, 6, 2; Nauck, Eur. Frag. 723; Paroem. Gr. II 209, M. 7, 78. Only the word Σπάρταν is quoted 1, 20, 3, it suggesting the remainder of the line. Other quotations are suggestive of the sentiment of Euripides, and require the Euripidean conclusion to complete the statement. Writing of Varro (2, 25, 1) he says: mirabiliter moratus est, sicut nosti:

εἰλικτὰ καὶ οὐδὲν [ὑγιές, ἀλλὰ πᾶν πέριξ φρονοῦντες]

(Androm. 449), sed nos tenemus praeceptum illud (Phoeniss. 393)

τὰς τῶν κρατούντων [ἀμαθίας φέρειν χρεών].

Cf. 15, 1a, 1 οὐδὲν ὑγιές; 10, 12, 4 nec ab eo quidquam ὑγιές. 10, 6, 2 nihil sincerum; 14, 21, 3 nihil sinceri. Similar statements seem to have been common in Greek comedy; cf. Aristoph. Thesm. 394; 656; Eccl. 326; Plutus 870. 13, 11 begins with Ion 586:

οὐ ταὐτὸν εἶδος [φαίνεται τῶν πραγμάτων
πρόσωθεν ὄντων ἐγγύθεν θ' ὁρωμένων].

To the usual request for advice is added 7, 13a, 4:

μάντις δ' ἄριστος [ὅστις εἰκάζει καλῶς].

Nauck, Frag. Eur. 973. Cf. de Div. 2, 5, 12 est quidam Graecus vulgaris in hanc sententiam versus:

bene qui coniciet, vatem hunc perhibebo optimum.

The attempts of Bibulus to be awarded a triumph disturbed Cicero's peace of mind, (6, 8, 5) nunc vero

αἰσχρὸν σιωπᾶν [βαρβάρους δ' ἐᾶν λέγειν].

A translation is given de Or. 3, 35, 141 Itaque Aristoteles quum florere Isocratem ... versumque quemdam Philoctetae paullo secus dixit. Ille enim turpe sibi ait esse tacere, quum barbaros, hic autem, quum Isocratem pateretur dicere. Quintilian 3, 1, 14 gives the same story (*ut traditur*) and quotes the line as modified by Aristotle:

αἰσχρὸν σιωπᾶν, Ἰσοκράτην δ' ἐᾶν λέγειν.

Digitized by Google

Entire line quotations are not numerous. Ad Fam. 13, 15, 5 (to Caesar) Itaque ab Homeri magniloquentia confero me ad vera praecepta Εὐριπίδου:

μισῶ σοφιστήν, ὅστις οὐχ αὑτῷ σοφός,

Nauck 905. Cf. Aristoph. Frogs 1427, assigned to Euripides:

μισῶ πολίτην, ὅστις ὠφελεῖν πάτραν
βραδὺς φανεῖται (or πέφυκε).

Cf. Paroem. Gr. 2, 534, Apost. 11, 71d, note. Ad Fam. 16, 8, 2 Cicero writes to Tiro:

ψῦχος δὲ λεπτῷ χρωτὶ πολεμιώτατον

inquit Euripides. Nauck 906. For the other quotations Cicero does not name the author: 9, 2a, 2 (Nauck 958):

τίς δ' ἐστὶ δοῦλος τοῦ θανεῖν ἄφροντις ἀν;

Quint. Frat. 2, 13, 5 (Suppl. 119):

τοιαῦθ' ὁ τλήμων πόλεμος ἐξεργάζεται.

7, 11, 1:

τὴν θεῶν μεγίστην ὥστ' ἔχειν τυραννίδα.

This is line 506 of the Phoeniss., which also furnished two lines, 524–5, frequently quoted by Caesar. See Cic. de Off. 3, 21, 82.

Other Poets.—Cicero begins 9, 13 with the words οὐκ ἔστ' ἄτυμος λόγος, from the well-known Palinode of Stesichorus, which was frequently quoted by the Greeks. See Fritzsche, Thesm., p. 372. To Phocylides is assigned one quotation, 7, 18, 4 ego autem, etsi illud ψευδησιόδειον (ita enim putatur) observo

μηδὲ δίκην [δικάσῃς πρὶν ἂν ἀμφοῖν μῦθον ἀκούσῃς].

This injunction was freely used by the Greeks, e. g. Aristoph. Wasps 725; Plato, Demodocus 382 E; Plut. de Stoic. Repug. 8, 1034 E; schol. ad Thucyd. 1, 44. Paroem. Gr. 2, 759, Mant. 2, 6. A line from Rhinthon is given 1, 20, 3 nam, ut ait Rhinton, ut opinor,

οἱ μὲν παρ' οὐδέν εἰσι, τοῖς δ' οὐδὲν μέλει.

The thought of the latter part is variously expressed: 6, 1, 17 μηδὲν αὐτοῖς, scis reliqua; 12, 2, 2 τί γὰρ αὐτῷ μέλει; 13, 20 μὴ γὰρ αὐτοῖς. Epicharmus is twice mentioned: 1, 19, 8 ut . . . mihi vafer ille Siculus insusurret Epicharmus cantilenam illam suam,

νᾶφε καὶ μέμνασ' ἀπιστεῖν· ἄρθρα ταῦτα τᾶν φρενῶν.

Digitized by Google

Quint. Frat. 3, 1, 23 nihil de praeceptis Epicharmi

γνῶθι, πῶς ἄλλῳ κέχρηται.

Anonymous.—The lines quoted 6, 3, 1 res enim in manibus, tu autem abes longe gentium,

πολλὰ δ' ἐν μεταιχμίῳ
νότος κυλίνδει κύματ' εὐρείης ἁλός,

are assigned by Bergk to Archilochus, though without sufficient reason. 5, 12, 1 Cicero may refer to ἄκρα Γυρέων, as does Archil. (frag. 54, II⁴, p. 397, Bergk), a conjecture for the more common ἀκρωτήρια οὔρια. The remaining anonymous quotations will be given in order of occurrence: 1, 12, 1 Tito mandavi σκήψεις atque ἀναβολαί, sed nescio an ταὐτόματον ἡμῶν [καλλίω βουλεύεται]. Nauck, Adesp. 320. Cf. Milo 20, 54 morae et tergiversationes. 4, 8a, 2 de Domitio

σύκῳ, μὰ τὴν Δήμητρα, σῦκον οὐδὲ ἕν
οὕτως ὅμοιον γέγονεν.

Meineke, Frag. Com. Anon. 4, 610, xxvi. 4, 11, 2 nos hic voramus litteras cum homine mirifico, Dionysio.

οὐδὲν γλυκύτερον ἢ πάντ' εἰδέναι.

Cf. the apparent parody of Aristoph. Birds 1343:

οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν τοῦ πέτεσθαι γλυκύτερον.

8, 5, 1 postea audivi a tertio milario tum eum isse

πολλὰ μάτην κεράεσσιν ἐς ἠέρα θυμήναντα,

multa, inquam, mala cum dixisset suo capiti, ut aiunt. This line perhaps served Latin poets for the typical description of the bull. Cf. Verg. A. 12, 103; G. 3, 232; Catull. 64, 111. In doubt as to the effects of the Ides of March, Cicero writes, 14, 22, 2: etsi illi iuvenes

ἄλλοις ἐν ἐσθλοῖς τόνδ' ἀπωθοῦνται ψόγον.

Ad Fam. 9, 7, 2 adventat enim Dolabella. Eum puto magistrum fore

πολλοὶ μαθηταὶ κρείσσονες διδασκάλων.

Anth. Pal. 11, 176; Nauck, Adesp. 107.

There are a number of short quotations which seem to be the beginning of lines, but nothing has been determined as to authorship. 13, 42, 1 σὺ δὲ δὴ τί σύννους; cf. Aristoph. Lysis. 599 σὺ δὲ δὴ τί μαθών; Frogs 865 σὺ δὲ δὴ τί βουλεύει; Quint. Frat. 2, 8, 3 †εἰ

Digitized by Google

δ' ἐν αἵᾳ ἔζησας numquam enim dicam ἓα πάσας. Q. F. 3, 9, 8 ἀλλ' οἰμωζέτω. 9, 7, 5 ὁ πλόος ὡραῖος obrepat; 9, 18, 3 exspecto equidem λαλαγεῦσαν illam tuam; 10, 2, 1 λαλαγεῦσα iam adest. These contain potential poetical material. Cf. Leon. Tarent., Anth. Pal. X 1:

ὁ πλόος ὡραῖος· καὶ γὰρ λαλαγεῦσα χελιδὼν
ἤδη μέμβλωκεν χὠ χαρίεις Ζέφυρος.

B. Prose-writers.

The prose quotations are limited to three authors, and of these Plato is represented only by the Epistles. He is mentioned by name 9, 13, 4 αἱ γὰρ τῶν τυράννων δεήσεις, inquit Πλάτων, οἶσθ' ὅτι μεμιγμέναι ἀνάγκαις (Ep. 7, 329d, modified). The statement 9, 10, 2 ita dies et noctes, tamquam avis illa mare prospecto, evolare cupio, is evidently an allusion to Ep. 7, 348a ἐγὼ μὲν βλέπων ἔξω καθάπερ ὄρνις ποθῶν ποθεν ἀναπτέσθαι. Ut ait Thucydides (1, 97) ἐκβολὴ λόγου occurs 7, 1, 7; and 10, 8, 7 is quoted a passage from Thucyd. (1, 138) referring to Themistocles. Two statements from Epicurus are given 7, 26, 1, and 15, 19, 2 (Cassius).

C. Proverbs.

Some of the proverbial statements used by Cicero were so regarded at that time, though but few of them are characterized as such. The larger part of them are to be found in the Paroemiographi Graeci (Leutsch and Schneidewin, 1839), to which references will be given. 1, 19, 2 τὸ ἐπὶ τῇ φακῇ μύρον is quoted by Gell. N. A. 13, 29, 5 from Varro. See Athen. 4, 160 B. Paroem. Gr. II 573, Apost. 13, 12, note. 1, 19, 10 hic tu cave dicas τίς πατέρ' αἰνήσει [εἰ μὴ κακοδαίμονες υἱοί]; Plutarch in Arato 1. Paroem. Gr. I 314, D 8, 46. 4, 8a, 1 εἴη μοι οὗτος (or μισητὸς) φίλος οἶκος. 15, 16a sed nescio quomodo οἶκος φίλος. The complete proverb was οἶκος φίλος, οἶκος ἄριστος. Paroem. Gr. I 438, App. 15, note; II 552, 39. Cf. Cercidas (Bergk, p. 514, 3):

οἶκος γὰρ ἄριστος ἀλαθέως καὶ φίλος.

5, 11, 5 quod superest, si verum est οἷαπερ ἡ δέσποινα, which, according to Rep. 8, 563 C, was a proverb at the time of Plato. Οἷαπερ ἡ δέσποινα τοία δὲ καὶ ἡ κύων in Paroem. Gr. II 44, D 3, 51; I 269, D 5, 93. Cf. Tennyson, Locksley Hall: "As the husband is the wife is." 5, 20, 3 Interim (scis enim dici quaedam πανικά, dici

Digitized by Google

item τὰ κενὰ τοῦ πολέμου). Cf. Paroem. Gr. I 300, D 7, 80, and the discussion of Classen ad Thucyd. 3, 30, 4.

6, 5, 3 meque obiurgavit vetere proverbio τὰ μὲν διδόμενα; also 15, 17, 1. Dem. 18, 119; Andoc. 1, 4; Plato, Gorg. 499 C. 6, 9, 3 τοὔμὸν ὄνειρον ἐμοὶ [λέγεις]. Plato, Rep. 8, 563 D. Cf. Suid. sub γνωρίζω: τὸ σὸν ὄναρ σοι διηγούμενος. Paroem. Gr. II 774, Mant. 3, 3. 8, 11, 3 tanta malorum impendet Ἰλιάς. Cf. Plaut. Mil. Glo. 743 east odiorum Ilias. Paroem. Gr. I 96, Z 4, 43 Ἰλιὰς κακῶν· ἀπὸ παροιμίας τοῦτο ἐλέγετο ἐπὶ τῶν μεγάλων κακῶν. 9, 9, 1 nosti illud Διονύσιος ἐν Κορίνθῳ. Ad Fam. 9, 18, 1; Tusc. Disp. 3, 12, 27 refer to this: Dionysius quidem tyrannus Syracusis expulsus Corinthi pueros docebat. Quint. 8, 6, 52 Dionysium Corinthi esse, quo Graeci utuntur. Cf. Val. Max. 6, 9, Ext. 6; Amm. Marc. 14, 11, 30. 10, 5, 1 quod mihi mandas de Quinto regendo Ἀρκαδίαν. This is from an oracle, Herod. 1, 66 Ἀρ. μ' αἰτεῖς, μέγα μ' αἰτεῖς, οὔ τοι δώσω. Paroem. Gr. I 207, D 2, 69. 10, 18, 1 Κωρυκαῖοι is used with proverbial force; cf. Paroem. Gr. I 104, Z 4, 75. Μακάρων νῆσοι (12, 3, 1) were frequently referred to, Paroem. Gr. I 78, Z 3, 86; II 18, 7, M 5, 81, note. Hesiod, Works and Days, 170; Plato, Sym. 179 E; 180 B, refer to Achilles, as does Callistratus ap. Athen. 15, 695 B:

νήσοισ δ' ἐν μακάρων σέ φασιν εἶναι
ἴναπερ ποδώκης Ἀχιλεύς.

The origin of one of the proverbs is given 13, 21, 4 hoc ne Hermodorus quidem faciebat, is, qui libros Platonis solitus divulgare, ex quo λόγοισιν Ἑρμόδωρος. Paroem. Gr. I 116, Z 5, 6. Sextus is referred to 16, 11, 1 εἷς ἐμοὶ μύριοι. Paroem. Gr. II 26, D 2, 52, note. Cf. 2, 5, 1 Cato ille noster, qui mihi unus est pro centum milibus. Brutus 191 quod dixisse Antimachum clarum poetam ferunt ... Legam, inquit, nihilo minus. Plato enim mihi unus instar est centum milium. Ad Fam. 6, 3, 4; 9, 3, 2 Cicero apologizes for his offerings: γλαῦκ' εἰς Ἀθήνας. (The Greek, or its Latin translation, Athenas noctuam mittam, is also found Quint. Frat. 2, 15, 4.) Cf. Aristoph. Birds 302 τίς γλαῦκ' Ἀθήναζ' ἤγαγεν; This was the Greek "coals to Newcastle." Paroem. Gr. I 59, Z 3, 6. Ad Fam. 7, 25, 1 rideamus γέλωτα σαρδάνιον. This goes as far back as the time of Homer (Od. 20, 302), and an explanation is added by the scholiast to the comment of Servius ad Verg. B. 7, 41 on *sardoniis herbis*. See Hentze, Anhang, Od. 20, 302. Paroem. Gr. II 638, Ap. 15, 35. Γνῶθι σεαυτόν occurs Quint. Frat. 3, 6, 7. The thought is expressed elsewhere by Cicero in Latin,

Digitized by Google

e. g. de Fin. 5, 16, 44 iubet igitur nos Pythius Apollo noscere nosmet ipsos; 3, 22, 73 vetera praecepta sapientium, qui iubent tempori parere et sequi deum et se noscere et nihil nimis. Tusc. Disp. 1, 22, 52. Paroem. Gr. I 391, Ap. 1, 80. Ad Fam. 12, 20 and 15, 17, 1 occurs *πάντα περὶ πάντων*; and 12, 14, 7 Lentulus, recounting the favors he had once received from his present political enemies, adds *πατρίδα ἐμὴν μᾶλλον φιλῶν*. Ad Fam. 16, 21, 5 Cicero sums up his experience at Athens: *τὰ μὲν οὖν καθ' ἡμᾶς τάδε*. Paroem. Gr. II 658, Ap. 16, 9a has *οὕτω γέγονεν, ὡς ἔδοξε τῷ θεῷ*. Wishing some information from Tiro, ad Fam. 16, 23, 2, Cicero writes *ἔγγιον γόνυ κνήμης*. Paroem. Gr. I 57, Z 3, 2. Cf. Plaut. Trin. 1154 tunica propior palliost. 16, 15, 3 Cicero exclaims *μηδὲ σωθείην ὑπό γε τοιούτου*. For the opposite sentiment see Paroem. Gr. II 547, App. 12, 19.

Some of the Greek expressions are capable of a wider application than that given by Cicero, and will be classified among the proverbs. *Εἰδόσι σοι λέγω* 9, 7, 3, though it emphasizes the subject, may be compared with the English 'a word to the wise.' The thought itself is as old as Homer, e. g. Il. 10, 250 *εἰδόσι . . . ἀγορεύειν*; 23, 787 *εἰδόσιν ὔμμ' ἐρίω*. Ad 4, 8, 4 the Greek is quoted from Atticus: de eo quod me mones, ut . . . *τὴν ἴσω γραμμὴν* teneam, ita faciam. Cf. *ἀπὸ γραμμῆς*, Paroem. Gr. I 210, D 2, 83a. Anxious about the publication of de Finibus, Cicero writes, 13, 21, 4 sed haec hactenus, ne videar *περὶ μικρὰ σπουδάζειν*. This much ado about nothing is also expressed elsewhere, e. g. Aristotle 1125, A 15; 1232, B 4. 'Calling a spade a spade' is suggested ad Fam. 9, 22, 4 habes scholam Stoicam *ὁ σοφὸς εὐθυρρημονήσει*. Cf. ad Fam. 12, 16, 3 si *εὐθυρρημονέστερος* videbor (Trebonius to Cicero).

6, 1, 1 non *οἴχεται* tua industria. Cf. Plaut. Trin. 418, and see Brix ad loc. With this verb may be placed 13, 31, 3 de epistula ad Caesarem *κέκρικα*. Cf. Pliny, Ep. 1, 12, 10 dixerat sane medico admoventi cibum *κέκρικα*. Similar to this is *βεβίωται*, 12, 2, 2. Cf. Sen. Ep. 12, 8 Pacuvius . . . sic in cubiculum ferebatur a cena ut inter plausus exoletorum hoc ad symphoniam caneretur *βεβίωται*! *βεβίωται*! Tota res fluctuat *κατ' ὀπώρην τρύξ*, 2, 12, 3, is the opposite of 'molasses in January.' 2, 1, 8 ut tu ais *ἅλις σπουδῆς* resembles *σπουδαῖον οὐδέν*, 13, 52, 2. Habes *σκυτάλην Λακωνικήν*, 10, 10, 3, refers to Antony's letter. Cf. Paroem. Gr. I 217, D 3, 25. Greek is worked in with the Latin 2, 19, 1 dices fortasse: dignitatis *ἅλις* tamquam *δρυός*. Paroem. Gr. I 42, Z 2, 40.

A few of the statements are of personal application: 1, 18, 6 sed interea *πολιτικὸς ἀνὴρ οὐδ' ὅναρ* quisquam inveniri potest; 13, 29,

Digitized by Google

2 κωμικὸς μάρτυς, ut opinor, accidit Phania (cf. Ἀττικὸς μάρτυς, Paroem. Gr. I 215, D 3, 11, and Polyb. 12, 13, 3 κωμικόν τινα μάρτυρα); 12, 4, 2 sed de Catone πρόβλημα Ἀρχιμήδειον. Cf. Cluent. 32, 87 non Archimedes melius potuit describere. There are two stereotyped expressions: καὶ τόδε Φωκυλίδου, 4, 9, 1, and Εὔπολιν, τὸν τῆς ἀρχαίας, 6, 1, 18. Two Greek names applied to Romans may be considered as proverbial: 2, 9, 1; 2, 12, 2 Βοῶπις is a suggestive epithet applied to Clodia, though de Domo 34, 92, and de Har. Resp. 18, 39 Cicero baldly states what he here merely suggests. 13, 12, 3 Varro is ridiculed: biennium praeteriit, cum ille Καλλιππίδης adsiduo cursu cubitum nullum processerit. The application to Tiberius is explained Suet. Tib. 38 vulgo per iocum Callipides vocabatur quem cursitare ac ne cubiti mensuram progredi proverbio Graeco notatum est. Paroem. Gr. II 757, Mant. 1, 87.

Detached Phrases.—There are numerous detached phrases which may be considered as colloquial expressions, though we do not know what their original associations may have been:—6, 1, 8 οὐκ ἔλαβέ σε; 6, 1, 20 πολλοῦ γε καὶ δεῖ, Dem. 326, 1; 537, 14; 7, 7, 7 συμπολιτεύομαί σοι; 7, 8, 5 ἄμορφον ἀντιπολιτευομένου χρεωφειλέτην; 7, 11, 2 ἐνσχολάζω σοι; 8, 8, 2 πολλὰ χαίρειν τῷ καλῷ; 2, 19, 1 τῷ καλῷ προσπέπονθα; 9, 10, 8 τὸ μέλλον καραδοκήσεις; 10, 1, 3 tuaque ista crebra ἐκφώνησις 'ὑπέρευ'; 12, 51, 2 τοῦτο δὲ μηλώσῃ; 13, 37, 2 φοβερὸν ἂν ἦν; 13, 38, 1 οὐκ ἐπέστησεν; 13, 49, 1 μέμψιν ἀναφέρει; 15, 12, 2 ἐὰν διαμείνῃ; 15, 20, 3 πάσχω τι; 16, 1, 1 ἔτ' ἐῶμεν.

Some have no verb expressed, and seem like catch-phrases:—2, 16, 4 εἰ δὲ μή; 6, 1, 20 τί λοιπόν; 6, 5, 3 ἄλλο πρόβλημα; 12, 12, 2 ἀνεμέσητον γάρ; 12, 41, 2 φιλαίτιον συμφορά; 13, 42, 2 καὶ μάλα κατηφής; 15, 12, 1 καὶ μάλα σεμνῶς; 14, 5, 1 μνημονικὸν ἁμάρτημα, and φυρμὸς πολύς; 16, 1, 4 λῆρος πολύς.

Ciceronian Phrases.—The statements which may be considered as Cicero's own contribution to the Greek of the Epistles are chiefly political, philosophical and geographical, with some entreaties and exclamations. The political phrases are the comments of Cicero on the passing political conditions of the times. πολιτικὸν σκέμμα 7, 8, 3; πολιτικωτάτων σκεμμάτων 10, 1, 3; πρᾶξις πολιτικοῦ 10, 13, 1; σύγχυσις τῆς πολιτείας 7, 8, 4; τὴν παροῦσαν κατάστασιν τυπωδῶς 4, 13, 2; Sampsiceramus . . . ὁμολογουμένως τυραννίδα συσκευάζεται 2, 17, 1.

There are a number of philosophical expressions, some of them

Digitized by Google

containing proper names or adjectives derived from proper names, and perhaps more suggestive than the Latin terms would have been; e. g. 13, 16, 1 *Ἀκαδημικὴ σύνταξις*. *φαντασία* is used in different connections: 9, 6, 5 *αἰσχροῦ φ.*; ad Fam. 15, 16 *διανοητικὴ φ.* and *κατ' εἰδώλων φ.* 2, 3, 2 *κατ' εἰδώλων ἐμπτώσεις* is part of an optical demonstration; ad Fam. 9, 4 *κατὰ Διόδωρον κρίνειν* and *κατὰ Χρύσιππον κρίνειν* are in a discussion *περὶ δυνατῶν*. *φιλοσοφώτερον διευκρινήσομεν* 7, 8, 3 refers to judgment in a will-case.

The geographical terms are names of well-known places and of places in his province: *Εὐμολπιδῶν πάτρια* 1, 9, 2; *Τηλέπυλον Δαιστρυγονίην* 2, 13, 2. Cf. 6, 2, 3.

In a few passages common Greek terms are contrasted, e. g. ad Fam. 7, 29, 1 sum enim *χρήσει μὲν* tuus, *κτήσει δὲ* Attici nostri; ad Fam. 16, 8, 1 *ἀκίνδυνα μέν, χρονιώτερα δὲ* nuntiant.

Cicero in a few passages has expressed his emotions in questions or in exclamations: 12, 5, 1 *ποῖ ταῦτ' ἄρα ἀποσκήψει;* 15, 12, 2 *τῶνδε αἰτίαν τῶν Βρούτων τίς ἴσχει;* seems to be a Latin statement turned into Greek. Cf. 14, 14, 2 quid ergo? ista culpa Brutorum? minime illorum quidem, sed aliorum Brutorum, qui se cautos ac sapientes putant. Indignation is expressed 6, 1, 17 de statua Africani *ὦ πραγμάτων ἀσυγκλώστων!* 10, 15, 2 *ὦ πολλῆς ἀγερωχείας!* 12, 9 nihil hac solitudine iucundius, nisi paulum interpellasset Amyntae filius *ὦ ἀπεραντολογίας ἀηδοῦς!* Regret for the failure of the work of the Ides of March is expressed 14, 12, 1 O mi Attice, vereor, ne nobis Idus Martiae nihil dederint praeter laetitiam et odii poenam ac doloris. Quae istim adferuntur! quae hic video! *ὦ πράξεως καλῆς μέν, ἀτελοῦς δέ.* What Cicero asks for in one thing may be granted him for his use of Greek, *τὸν τῦφόν μου πρὸς θεῶν τροποφόρησον*, 13, 29, 2.

There are about forty prepositional phrases, some governing adjectives with the article, e. g. 7, 13, 3 *πρὸς τὸ ἀσφαλές*; 2, 7, 4 *πρὸς τὸ πρακτικόν*. Some of these are equal to adverbs, e. g. 13, 51, 1 *πρὸς ἴσον ὅμοιον*que scriberem. Ad 5, 19, 3 are used two infinitives with article: ut libet, sed plane gaudeo, quoniam *τὸ νεμεσᾶν* interest *τοῦ φθονεῖν* ('As you please, but I'm right glad, for this thing of being wroth is different from being envious').

Individual Words.

The citations in the Thesaurus of Stephanus have been taken as determining the occurrences of individual words, and they have been classified as occurring only in Cicero, and first in

Digitized by Google

Cicero. However, these statements are of little moment, for, while they may be true for what remains of the Greek vocabulary, they might not be true if we had all the vocabulary of the time of Cicero and of the few preceding centuries. The number of words in each class is somewhat affected by conjectures, which in a few passages must be accepted or the Greek letters be left uninterpreted. 12, 12, 1 *ἐκτρόπιμος*, the older reading, has given way to *ἐκτοπισμός*. The reading *ὁ γναφεὺς ἀνθρακεύς* for †*ὅτε ναῦς ἄνθρακες*, 15, 5, 1, adds to the words found first in Cicero. *Ἁπλογραφία*, 16, 11, 3, may be the exact title of the work of Varro, or merely descriptive of it. See Ernesti Clavis Ciceroniana, s. v. A few words used by Diodorus and Strabo have been given as used first by Cicero, though the words must have been a part of the current vocabulary. Cicero seems to have made a few puns on the names of some of his friends, and perpetuated them in his Epistles; yet there were other punsters then, and it must be borne in mind that the Epistles give us about all that is left of such language in Cicero's day.

Cicero coined some nouns and adjectives which indicate his facility as a punster. 2, 12, 4 Dicaearchum recte amas; luculentus homo est et civis haud paulo melior quam isti nostri *ἀδικαίαρχοι*. 4, 15, 4 ex quo intellectum est *τρισαρειοπαγίτας* . . . rem publicam flocci non facere. Two statements refer to the freedman Philotimus: 6, 9, 2 *παραφύλαξον* si me amas *τὴν τοῦ φυράτου φιλοτιμίαν αὐτόρατα*. 7, 1, 1 ne quid *φιλοτιμία* eius, quem nosti, nobis noceret. Somewhat similar to this is 7, 12, 2 nam istum quidem, quoius *φαλαρισμὸν* times, omnia taeterrime facturum puto. Appius is complimented ad Fam. 3, 1, 1 Minerva . . . quam quidem ego . . . non solum *Παλλάδα* sed etiam *Ἀππιάδα* nominabo. Ad Fam. 7, 32, 1 (to Volumnius Eutrapelus, see ad Fam. 9, 26, 1) *εὐτραπελία* litterarum fecit, ut intellegerem tuas esse, is probably a punning application of the Greek word. The same letter contains a word which Cicero seems to have coined: quoniam tanta faex est in urbe, ut nihil tam sit *ἀκύθηρον* quod non alicui venustum videatur. *Ἀκύθηρον* occurs again, Eunap. vit. Porph., p. 10. The word as used by Cicero may be intended as a thrust at Eutrapelus, for we read 9, 26, 2 audi reliqua: infra Eutrapelum Cytheris accubuit. There are two Greek comparatives formed on the names of his friends: *ἀττικώτερος* 1, 13, 5, and *σηστιωδέστερος* 7, 17, 2.

Adverbs.—Cicero uses fifty-one different adverbs—forty-one positive forms, seven comparative, and four superlative. Five are

Digitized by Google

not found elsewhere: 12, 3, 1 *ἀγοητεύτως*; 6, 1, 7 *ἀκοινωνήτως* (as an adj. Pliny, Ep. 3, 9, 8); 13, 23, 3 *εὐαγώγως* (a conjecture of Bosius); 10, 10, 1 *παροινικῶς* (?); 15, 16, 1 *πεπινωμένως*. Cf. 14, 7, 2 litterae *πεπινωμέναι*. Some kindred form of all these words is found in Greek authors.

Several adverbs appear first in Cicero, the occurrence of both adverbial and adjective forms in later writers indicating that they were not uncommon. *αὐθεντικῶς* 9, 14, 2; *γενικῶς* 1, 14, 2; *εὐστομάχως* 9, 5, 2. Some of them are rarely used: *ἀκεραίως* 15, 21, 2; *ἀκολακεύτως* 13, 51, 1; *λεληθότως* 6, 5, 3; ad Fam. 9, 2, 3; *συμπαθῶς* 5, 11, 7; 12, 44, 1; *τυπωδῶς* 4, 13, 2. Polybius uses *ὑπερβολικῶς*, ad Att. 5, 21, 7; 6, 2, 4; and *ἐμφατικώτερον*, ad Brut. 1, 1, 1. The latter and *γενικώτερον*, 9, 10, 6, are not of frequent occurrence as comparatives. Of the superlatives, *ἀσμεναίτατα* 13, 22, 1 (Plato, Rep. I 329 C); *αὐτότατα* 6, 9, 2; *ἀττικώτατα* 15, 1a, 2; *φιλοπροσωπέστατα* 5, 9, 1; the last two seem to occur only in Cicero.

Less than one-half (twenty-two) are simple adverbs. Nine are negatives with *ἀ-*; five have *εὐ-*; five *φιλο-*, and ten others are compounds of various formations, e. g. 1, 14, 2 *ἀριστοκρατικῶς*; 2, 13, 1 *αὐθωρεί*; 4, 15, 5 *ἡμερολεγδόν*.

Adjectives.—A number of personal adjectives are not freely used, though their appearance first or only in Cicero is not of special significance: 7, 7, 4 *Ἀβδηριτικός*. Cf. 4, 16, 6 hic Abdera non tacente me; 13, 12, 3; 13, 16, 1 *Ἀκαδημική*, which, as Stephanus suggests, may be from the Latin for the regular *Ἀκαδημαϊκός*; 13, 12, 3; 13, 16, 1 *Ἀντιόχειος* (?); 13, 19, 4 *Ἀριστοτέλειος*; Petit. Cons. 10, 39 *Ἐπιχάρμειον*; 15, 4, 3; 15, 13, 3; 15, 27, 2; 16, 2, 6 *Ἡρακλείδειον*; 13, 19, 4 *περιπατητικός*; ad Fam. 9, 4 *Χρυσίππεια* (?), where *Chrysippi an* is now read.

The following positive forms are used by Cicero alone: 2, 17, 2 *ἀφιλόδοξος*, the negative of a common adjective. 6, 1, 23 *ἀναντιφώνητος*, which has the corresponding noun-form 15, 13, 2, and it too is found nowhere else. 13, 19, 3 *φιλένδοξος*; Quint. Frat. 2, 8, 1 *μουσοπάτακτος* or *μουσοπάταγος* are similar to other late compounds. 1, 6, 2; 1, 9, 2 *γυμνασιώδης*, and 7, 18, 4 *ψευδησιόδειος* are regular, while *πεντέλοιπος* is an irregular formation. 6, 1, 2 is used the diminutive *ὑπομεμψίμοιρος*. Cf. Polyb. 4, 60, 9 *μεμψιμοιρητέον*. Cf. Paroem. Gr. II 519, Apost. 11, 17b.

There are four comparative forms apparently not found elsewhere: Quint. Frat. 3, 3, 4 *θετικώτερος*; *φιλολογώτερος* 13, 2, 3. *Ἐνερευθέστερος*, 12, 4, 1, is in an apparent quotation: angebar

Digitized by Google

enim, quod Tiro *ἐν.* te sibi esse visum dixerat; and 12, 1, 2 *γεροντικώτερον* is the comparative of an adjective quoted from Atticus: quod scribis 'igniculum matutinum *γεροντικόν*,' *γεροντικώτερον* est memoriola vacillare.

The superlatives not found elsewhere are: *ἀπρακτότατος* 1, 14, 6; *παραδοξότατος* 6, 1, 16; *ἀπολιτικώτατος* and *ἀστρατηγικώτατος* 8, 16, 1: quem ego hominem *ἀπ.* omnium iam ante cognoram, nunc vero *ἀστ.* The comparatives of the affirmative forms of these adjectives are found Polyb. 4, 19, 11. *Ἀστρατήγητος*, 7, 13, 1, occurs Plato, Alcibiades 2, 142 C, and in late Greek.

The following adjectives seem to occur first in Cicero, and some of them are found but rarely in later writers: *ἀζηλοτύπητος* 13, 19, 4; *ἀκενόσπουδος* ad Fam. 15, 17 (quoted by Suidas from M. Ant. 1, 6); *ἀναντίλεκτος* Quint. Frat. 2, 8, 1; *ἀναπάντητος* 9, 1, 3 (Allat. Graec. Orthodox., vol. II, p. 208 C); *ἀνεμοφόρητος* 13, 37, 4; *ἀνηθοποίητος* 10, 10, 6; *ἀπροσδιόνυσος* 16, 12, 2; *ἀπροσφώνητος* 8, 8, 1; *ἀσύγκλωστος* 6, 1, 17 (Synes. 198 C); *δυσδιάγνωστος* 5, 4, 1; *ἑπτάλοφος* 6, 5, 2; *εὐανάτρεπτος* 2, 14, 1; *εὐρίπιστος* 14, 5, 2; *κενόσπουδος* 9, 1, 1; *οἰκοδεσποτικός* 12, 44, 2 is quoted by Stephanus from Proc. in Ptolem. Tetrab., p. 175; *ὑπεραττικὸς* 15, 1a, 2; *ὑποσόλοικος* 2, 10; *φιλειδήμων* 12, 6, 2. Ad 6, 9, 3 meque *ἐπιχρονία ἐποχή* tua dubitatione liberavit, is used the feminine form of the adjective, which is quoted from but one other writer.

Of the superlatives apparently used first by Cicero, *ἱστορικώτατος* 6, 2, 3 is found also Plut. Sertor. 9; and *πολυγραφώτατος* 13, 18, 1, Diog. Laert. 10, 26. Some of the comparative forms do not seem to occur frequently, though the positive forms are classical: *ἀνεκτότερος* 12, 45, 2; *εὐγενέστερος* 13, 21, 7; *λογικώτερος* 13, 19, 5; *μετεωρότερος* 16, 5, 3.

One of the noticeable features in the use of adjectives is the number—fifty-four—derived from verbs. Of these only five are simple adjectives, twenty-eight having *ἀ-*, two *δυς-*, five *εὐ-*, two *ψευδο-*. Four are formed from noun and verbal: *ἀνεμοφόρητος* 13, 37, 4; *μουσοπάρακτος* Quint. Frat. 2, 8; *τυραννοκτόνοι* 6, 4, 3 (in Latin, e. g., 14, 6, 2; 14, 15, 2; 14, 21, 3; ad Fam. 12, 22, 1); *πτολιπόρθιος* (Homeric) 10, 13, 2. Of the remainder the majority are made up of adjectives and verbal forms: *δίβαφος* 2, 9, 2 (in Latin ad Fam. 2, 16, 7); *ἐπίτηκτος* 7, 1, 5; *κενόσπουδος* 9, 1, 1; *νεόκτιστος* 6, 2, 2; *ὀψιμαθεῖς* ad Fam. 9, 20, 2; *περιτέλοιπος* 14, 21, 4; 15, 2, 4; *πολυγράφος* 13, 18, 1; *χρηστομαθής* 1, 6, 2; *ὑπομεμψίμοιρος* 1, 1, 2.

One hundred and twenty-one of the adjectives are not derived from verbs, and of these fifty-two are simple forms. Of the sixty-

Digitized by Google

nine others, nineteen have ἀ-, two δυς-, five εὐ-, eleven φιλο-. The thirty-two remaining are of various formations, e. g. γλυκύπικρος 5, 21, 4; ἑπταμηνιαῖος 10, 18, 1; κακοστόμαχος ad Fam. 16, 4, 1.

Nouns.—The following nouns are found only in Cicero, though some of them have a corresponding adjective or verbal form in Greek authors: ἀκοπία ad Fam. 16, 18, 1; ἀναντιφωνησία 15, 13, 2; ἀνιστορησία 15, 13, 2. ἀπόγραφον 12, 52, 3, and πρόπλασμα 12, 41, 4 are used by Pliny as Latin words. ἀτριψία 13, 16, 1; βούλυσις 15, 27, 3; (ἐκτρόπιμος 12, 12, 1;) κοιλιολυσία 10, 13, 1; εὐλυσία κοιλίας ad Fam. 16, 18, 1; λάπισμα 9, 13, 4; μακροψυχία (if correct form instead of μικροψυχία) 9, 11, 4; ὁμόπλοια 16, 1, 3; 16, 4, 4; πεπλογραφία 16, 11, 3; ῥωπογραφία 15, 16a, 1; σχεδίασμα 15, 19, 2; φιλορήτωρ 1, 13, 5; φυρατής 6, 9, 2. Two are quoted by Cicero: hanc, ut Siculi dicunt, ἀνεξίαν 5, 11, 5; indices, quos vos Graeci, ut opinor, σιλλύβους appellatis 4, 4a, 1. There are two diminutives not found elsewhere: ἀποσπασμάτιον 2, 3, 1; στρατύλλαξ 16, 15, 3.

The following seem to occur first in Cicero: ἀδιαφορία 2, 17, 2; ἀκαταληψία 13, 19, 2; ἀμφιλαφία Q. F. 2, 6, 3; 2, 14, 3 (Geoponica 2, 1, 8); ἀναθεώρησις 14, 5, 1; 14, 16, 2; ἀπεραντολογία 12, 9; ἀφίδρυμα 13, 29; διαπολιτεία 9, 4, 2; διαφόρησις 16, 18, 1; δυσωπία 13, 23; 16, 15; ἐκφώνησις 16, 18, 1; ἐπισταθμεία 13, 52, 2; καταβίωσις 13, 1, 2; παρεγχείρησις 15, 4, 3; προσφώνησις 13, 12, 3; σκιαμαχία ad Fam. 11, 4, 1; τεχνολογία 4, 16, 3; τοποθεσία 1, 13, 5; 1, 16, 18; φιλοτέχνημα 13, 40, 1; φυρμός 14, 5, 1. Ἐγγήραμα 12, 25, 2; 29, 2; 42, 2; σχόλιον and εὐθανασία 16, 7, 2 are quoted from Atticus. See Suet. Aug. 99 εὐθανασίαν similem (hoc enim et verbo uti solebat).

Cicero uses 324 Greek nouns. The following table gives the number of nouns with different endings, the most common prefixes, and the number of compounds of nouns and adjectives:

	ἀ-.	δυς-.	εὐ-.	φιλο-.	Prepositions.	Noun and Adj.	Noun and Noun.	Total Comp.	Total Number.
-ία,	16	4	11	3	17	10	8	69	84
-η,	—	–	—	–	15	—	2	17	38
-μα,	—	–	1	1	19	1	—	22	38
-σις,	1	–	—	–	31	—	—	32	48
-της,	—	–	1	–	1	1	2	5	9
Various,	3	–	—	–	26	5	4	38	107
	20	4	13	4	109	17	16	183	324

Verbs.—The following verbs are used only by Cicero: ἀλογεύεσθαι 6, 4, 3; ἀντιμυκτηρίσαι (Cassius) ad Fam. 15, 19, 4; ἀφομιλεῖν

Digitized by Google

ad Fam. 16, 17, 1; *ἐνεπερπερευσάμην* 1, 14, 4; *ἐντυραννεῖσθαι* 2, 14, 1; *ἐξακανθίζειν* 6, 6, 1; *πλουδοκεῖν* 10, 8, 9; *συμφιλοδοξεῖν* 5, 17, 2; *φαινοπροσωπεῖν* 7, 21, 1.

Cicero seems to have been the first to use *ἀνθηρογραφεῖσθαι* 2, 6, 1; *ἐξασφαλίσασθαι* 6, 4, 5; *εὐθυρρημονεῖν* ad Fam. 9, 22, 4; *παριστορῆσαι* 6, 1, 25; *προεκκεῖσθαι* 6, 5, 2; *προσανατρέφεσθαι* 6, 1, 2; *συμφιλολογεῖν* ad Fam. 16, 21, 8; *συναπογράφεσθαι* (Athen. 5, 214 E; 9, 385 C) 9, 4, 2; *τροποφορεῖν* 13, 29, 2; †*κεπφοῦσθαι* 13, 40, 2.

One hundred and thirty-four verbs were noticed, of which seventy-four are compounds. Forty-three have one preposition, while the following, in addition to three given in the last paragraph, have two: *παρεμβάλλειν* ad Fam. 9, 10, 1; *συναποθανεῖν* 7, 20, 2; *συνδιημερεύειν* 8, 9, 3; *ὑπεκθέσθαι* 7, 17, 4. Four have *ἀ-*, two *εὐ-*, and seven a noun as one part of the compound, e. g. *ζηλοτυπεῖν* 13, 18, 1; *θορυβοποιεῖν* 16, 23, 2. Five have adjectives, e. g. *ὀλιγωρεῖν* 6, 5, 3; and six are of various formations: *διευκρινεῖν* 7, 8, 3; †*διευθετῆσθαι* 6, 5, 2; *προοικονομῆσαι* Quint. Frat. 2, 3, 6; *φαινοπροσωπεῖν* 7, 21, 1; 14, 22, 2; *συμφιλοδοξεῖν* 5, 17, 2; *συμφιλολογεῖν* ad Fam. 16, 2.

Disputed Readings.

The Greek in the MSS of the Epistles has been fairly well preserved, though there has been confusion at some points. All that can be done with these passages is to seek a remedy by conjecture, and the choice of several is offered at most defective places; e. g., for ΔΥCCΕΚΙΛΛΗΤΑ 5, 10, 4, *δυσέκλεκτα, δυσεξείλητα, δυσεκλάλητα, δυσεξίλλητα, δυσεξέλικτα, δυσδιήγητα, δυσδιεξήγητα.* For ΕΚΙΤΑΟΝΟΝ 10, 13, 3, the conjecture of Ellis, *ἐπίσταθμον*; for ΜΙΑCΚΟΡΔΟU 13, 42, 3, that of Tyrrell, *μὴ σκόρδου*, seem conclusive, though for the latter *μίασμα δρυός* once seemed satisfactory. See Paroem. Gr. I 434, Z 2, 84. For ΠΑΡΛΟΤΛΕΥΤΘΟΝ 10, 12, 2, *παρακλεπτέον, παραπλευτέον*, and *πόρον κλεπτέον* have been suggested. The words of Cicero are: quo me nunc vertam? undique custodior. sed satis lacrimis. ΠΑΡ. igitur et occulte in aliquam onerariam corrependum. *Παραλογευτέον* nearly reproduces the letters of the MSS, and, though the word is not found elsewhere, Cicero has a kindred form, *ἀλογευόμενος* 6, 4, 3. Ad 4, 18, 1 *γοργεῖα γυμνά, πορεῖα πυκνά*, and *πρῷρα πρύμνα* have been given for ΠΟΡΠΑ-ΠΥΜΝΑ. Cf. ad Fam. 16, 24, 1 mihi prora et puppis, ut Graecorum proverbium est, fuit a me tui dimittendi. This passage supports the reading last given, though the sense can be as well preserved by reading *opera humana*, the capital letters of which

Digitized by Google

resemble the MSS reading as closely as do any of the Greek readings suggested. The same epistle offers another puzzle—OYCOIMPICAMAΦIHI. Antiochum Gabinium . . . lege Papia condemnarunt. Itaque dixit statim †resp. lege maiestatis. The many conjectures at this point show the hopelessness of attempts at interpretation. *οὐ σοί, Ἄρες, ἀλλὰ Παφίῃ* retains the possible punning and contrast involved in the word *Papia*. 10, 12a, 4 est enim indoles, modo aliquod †hoc sit *ἦθος* AKIMOAON quod si adhuc nullum est, esse tamen potest, aut *ἀρετὴν* non est *διδακτόν*, quod mihi persuaderi non potest. The reading *ὄλκιμος* is possible, as kindred forms of the word are similarly used: Plato, Legg. 2, 659 D, *παιδεία . . . ἐσθ' ἡ παίδων ὁλκή τε καὶ ἀγωγὴ πρὸς τὸν . . . λόγον*. Rep. 7, 521 D, *μάθημα ψυχῆς ὁλκὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ γιγνομένου ἐπὶ τὸ ὄν*.

How far the desire for a display of his knowledge may have entered into Cicero's use of Greek in the Epistles is a matter of interpretation. The material collected by Lange, Quid cum de ingenio et litteris tum de poetis Graecorum Cicero senserit (Diss. Phil. Hal., vol. IV, pp. 221–90), shows that Cicero frequently translated Greek, both poetry and proverbs, into Latin, and the same course was open to him in the Epistles; but, in harmony with prevailing social canons, writing to men thoroughly conversant with Greek and using it in communications to Cicero, his practice would evoke no criticism. The modern student of Greek has some ground to commend him, for Cicero's Greek vocabulary adds somewhat to the other Greek vocabulary that has come down to us, and the words used first by him throw a little light on its historical development.

It is impossible to decide from the quotations how familiar Cicero was with the works from which his quotations come. The range of the quotations is not great, nor are there indications of an extensive acquaintance with Greek literature. All that was proverbial may be held to have had a place in the current of social communication, and to this indefinite source may likewise be assigned a few passages which, because of their prominence, were quoted by other writers. Longer quotations may represent an intimate acquaintance with the works from which they come; they may have been gleaned from 'Choice Selections' or may represent a cursory reading for quotation purposes; but, in the absence of any statement by Cicero bearing on the question, no definite answer can be given.

Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington, Ill. R. B. Steele.

Digitized by Google

IV.—ON THE WEDDING STANZA, RIG-VEDA, X. 40. 10.

The history of the interpretation of this stanza is instructive, first, because it illustrates the great variety of misleading suggestions which may emanate from a Vedic stanza when studied purely from within; secondly, because it emphasizes anew the futility of all attempts at understanding Vedic passages which were originally constructed within a certain environment, and under the impulse of certain accompanying actions, without searching in the first place for that environment and that action. The following pages aim to remedy this defect: the writer may hope that his discussion has brought the problem nearer to a solution, even if he has not cleared every doubt which arises in the interpretation of this difficult stanza:

jīvám rudanti ví mayante adhvaré
dīrghám ánu prásitim dīdhiyur[1] *náraḥ:*
vāmám pitṛ́bhyo yá idám sameriré
máyaḥ pátibhyo jánayaḥ pariṣváje.

The Petersburg Lexicon under *rud* 2) imparts a certain bent to subsequent translations by rendering the word by 'bejammern.' Grassmann translates (vol. II, p. 472): 'Sie beweinen den lebenden, gehen hin und her (?) beim Opferfest; die Männer sannen der langen Noth nach, sie, welche hier den Ahnen schöne Gaben gebracht haben, [während] die Weiber ihren Gatten Freude [gewähren] zur umarmung.' No wonder that he feels constrained to separate that part of the hymn which begins here from the main body of his translation, to relegate five stanzas to the appendix, and to describe them as obscure and secondary. Ludwig's translation is no less perplexing: 'nach dem lebenden weinen sie, vertauschen ihn beim opfer; auf weiten wurf hin haben die männer gedacht, die dieses schöne den Pitar zugebracht haben, (während) heil den gatten die frau zur umarmung.'

Lanman has dealt with the passage in the notes to his Sanskrit Reader, p. 387[a], as follows: 'The import of the very obscure (if

[1] The Pet. Lex., under *prasiti* 4), and √*dhī* + *anu*, reads *dīdhiṣur*, for which there is no manuscript authority.

Digitized by Google

not hopelessly corrupt) stanza is probably this. The first half tells what happens at the burial of a wife. While the rest lament aloud, the men show their sorrow for the bereaved husband by pensive silence. The second half contains reflections on the joys of wedlock, whose appositeness is clear, if we assume that they are uttered in a tone of mournful regret.' He then translates: 'They weep for the living one (the widower). They cry aloud at the service. The men thought over the long reach (of his happy life now past). A lovely thing for the fathers, who have come together here,—a joy to husbands—are wives to embrace.' This explanation and translation deserves much credit for its sturdy determination to strain some sense out of the passage, but the picturesque, complex sentiment savors rather of the stage, and the subtle, subjective reasoning between the lines warns us that there is something wrong. About half of the situation is imagined and without support in the text. Nor is there any employment of the stanza which points to funeral rites of any sort. Finally Fay, in his dissertation, The Rig-Veda Mantras in the Gṛhya-Sūtras, p. 37, follows the Sūtra in treating the verse as a wedding stanza; hence he translates the words *jīvaṁ rudanti* correctly. But in most other regards I am led to different conclusions.

The stanza occurs also in AV. xiv. 1. 46, with several variants: *nayanty* for *mayante*, *adhvaráṁ* for *adhvaré*, *dıdhyuḥ* for *dıdhiyuḥ*, *ırıré* for *eriré*, and *jánaye* for *jánayaḥ*. For this version the following translation has been proposed by Weber, Ind. Stud. V 200: 'Es jauchzen laut, ordnen die opferweise, und hoffen auf langes geschlecht die männer, die den manen dies hier zu lieb bewirkten, den gatten zur wonne,—des weibes umarmung.' The translation of *jīvám rudanti* by 'es jauchzen laut' was proposed previously by Langlois, who renders the words by 'ils font entendre des cris de joie,' and explains it by 'ils poussent de vivats.'[1] Weber seems to have been led to adopt this view of the words partly by their occurrence among the wedding stanzas of the Atharvan, and partly because the stanza in question is coupled in Kāuç. 79. 30 with AV. xiv. 2. 59; in the latter the word *ródena* occurs together with *sam ánarṭiṣuḥ* 'they have danced,' a combination which seemed at that time to render the

[1] Langlois seems to have arrived at this conception independently, since Sāyaṇa furnishes no support for it in his indigestible rendering: *naraḥ patayo jāyānāṁ jīvaṁ jīvanam uddiçya rudanti rodanenā 'pi jāyānāṁ jīvanam evā "çāsata ity arthaḥ.*

Digitized by Google

word *ródena* unfit for the ordinary meaning of 'howling, wailing,' suggesting, on the other hand, that of 'joyous shouting.' But AV. xiv. 2. 59 has been treated in our 'Contributions,' Second Series, AJPh. XI, p. 336 (18 of the reprint) ff., with the result that the ordinary meaning of the word is sustained.

The stanza is employed in the Gṛhya-sūtras of the Rig-Veda, in the Kāuçika, in Āp. Gṛ. ii. 4. 6 (Mantrapāṭha i. 1. 6), and Bāudh. Gr. i. 10. In Çāṅkh. Gṛ. i. 15. 2, and Āçv. Gṛ. i. 8. 4, the verse is recited by the bridegroom as he leaves with his newly-married bride the house of her parents: *jīvaṁ rudantī 'ti prarudantyām* (Çāṅkh.); *jīvaṁ rudantī 'ti rudatyām* (Āçv.) 'When she cries let him recite the stanza which begins with the words *jīvaṁ rudanti*.' Stenzler, in his translation of Āçv., renders: 'Den vers: "Sie jauchzen laut" spricht er, wenn sie weint,' obviously following Weber's translation of the Atharvan version,[1] but without defining the relation of his rendering to the employment of the stanza in his text. So also Haas, Ind. Stud. V, p. 402. Oldenberg, in the German translation of Çāṅkh. (Ind. Stud. XV, p. 30 ff.), renders: '"den lebenden beweinen sie" wenn sie zu weinen anfängt.' Similarly he renders both passages in his English versions of Çāṅkh. and Āçv. in the Sacred Books of the East, vol. XXIX, pp. 39, 170.

Winternitz, in his valuable essay Das altindische Hochzeitsritual nach dem Āpastambīya-Gṛhyasūtra (Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, vol. XL, p. 42), points out that the occasional crying of the bride had here in all probability assumed the form of a rigid custom, and following this indication, he renders the words *prarudantyām* and *rudatyām* by '*when* she cries.' In Kāuç. 79. 30 the practice is mentioned at the end of the entire wedding ceremony, somewhat secondarily in the manner of an expiation for an offence against the normal order of the event. The bride is wooed and prepared for the bridegroom in chapter 75; the marriage ceremony proper and the preparations for the journey to the home of the bridegroom are described in 76; the journey to the new home and the arrival are described in 77; the formal reception, in 78; the consummation of the marriage and certain ceremonies attaching thereto, in 79. In 79. 29 the priest receives his fee, and, finally, 79. 30 reads: *jīvaṁ rudanti yadī 'me keçina iti juhoti* 'with the

[1] Weber's translation was published in 1862; Stenzler's, in 1865.

Digitized by Google

stanzas whose pratīkas are *jīvaṁ rudanti* (AV. xiv. 1. 46) and *yadī 'me keçinaḥ* (AV. xiv. 2. 59),[1] he offers an oblation of ghee.' The mention of this ceremony here at the end can have but one meaning: it is intended to meet a possible case, not an integral part of the practices. Accordingly, Keçava takes precisely this view: *nīyamānāyāṁ pitṛgṛhe yadi* (! not *yadā*) *rodanaṁ bhavati tadā idaṁ prāyaçcittam* (!) ... *rudanaprāyaçcittaṁ samāptam.* The characterization of this practice as an expiatory act, and the omission of any mention of it in Gobhila and Pāraskara seem to show that the bride's wailing was not obligatory. Cf. also Hillebrandt, Ritual-Litteratur, pp. 2, 67.

The meaning of the words *jīvaṁ rudanti* is circumscribed pretty definitely by the form under which they are quoted in the Gṛhya-sūtras of the Black Yajus-schools. In Bāudh. Gṛ. i. 10 we have the following Sūtra: *sā yady açru kuryāt tām anumantrayate jīvāṁ rudanti ... iti*; see Winternitz, ibid., p. 43. In Āp. Gṛ. ii. 4. 6 the same stanza is referred to: *prāpte nimitte uttarāṁ japet* 'when the occasion has arrived he shall recite the following stanza.' The stanza in question is given in the Mantrapāṭha i. 1. 6 (Winternitz, pp. 6, 12, 42). Haradatta explains the Sūtra as follows: *vadhvāḥ svabandhūnāṁ ca rodanaṁ nimittaṁ jīvāṁ rudanti 'ti lingāt, uttarām ṛcaṁ jīvāṁ rudanti 'ty etām*, i.e. 'when the bride and her relatives cry (he recites) the stanza beginning with the words *jīvāṁ rudanti*.' The change of *jīvaṁ* to *jīvāṁ* is a so-called *ūha, vikāra* or *saṁnāma*[2]; it contributes to the criticism of the stanza at least this much, that it proves that Bāudhāyana and Āpastamba interpret the word *jīvam* as an accusative governed by *rudanti*. I have myself thought for a long time that *jīvam* is to be taken as an adverb (viva voce), and

[1] The addition of this stanza, or rather the four stanzas 59–62 (cf. Keç. at 79. 30), is obviously secondary, being due to the occurrence in the first three of them of the word *rodena*. They are funeral stanzas, as we have shown in 'Contributions,' second series, AJPh. XI, p. 336 (18 of the reprint) ff. The external similarity of *rodena* and *rudanti* is quite sufficient ground for introducing these stanzas by way of strengthening the effect of the practice. Cf. Fay, l. c., p. 22.

[2] In Āp. Çr. vi. 26. 3, and frequently in the sequel, the verb *saṁ-namati* is employed to designate this 'tinkering' process by which a stanza is adapted or modified by some verbal change for some performance in hand. Elsewhere, e. g. Āçv. Gṛ. iii. 8. 7; Kāuç. 60. 20; 63. 12, the causative *saṁnamayati* is employed. In the Kalpa of Āpastamba this mode of handling Mantras seems to be peculiarly frequent.

Digitized by Google

Ludwig's last suggestion (Rig-Veda, vol. V, p. 589) is to the same effect. There is now no longer any doubt in my mind that the words must be rendered by 'they bewail the living one.'

One more point can be established with certainty. The stanza refers to some event in a wedding ceremony, probably not very different from that within which the Sūtras have imbedded it. This seems to follow from a passage in TB. i. 5. 1. 2, which deserves most careful analysis. The entire chapter i. 5. 1 is devoted to a description of persons and articles which are in turn subject to each of the constellations (*nakṣatra*). Two are mentioned in connection with each constellation, one being situated *parastād*, the other *avastād* of the *nakṣatra*.[1] The passage reads: *pitṝṇāṁ maghāḥ, rudantaḥ parastad apabhraṅço 'vastāt, aryamṇaḥ pūrve phalgunī, jāyā parastād ṛṣabho 'vastāt, bhagasyo 'ttare, vahatavaḥ parastād vahamānā avastāt.* 'The constellation *maghāḥ* is sacred to the Fathers; those who weep are above, the fall is below. The constellation *pūrve phalgunī* is sacred to Aryaman; the wife is above, the bull (male) below. The constellation *uttare phalgunī* is sacred to Bhaga; bridal processions are above, those who escort (the married couple) are below.' The entire passage echoes faintly certain stanzas of RV. x. 40: *rudantaḥ* corresponds to *rudanti* in st. 10; *apabhraṅço* reminds us of *patáyat kanīnakó* in st. 9[2]; *jāyā* corresponds to *jánayaḥ* in st. 10; and *ṛṣabho* to *priyósriyasya vṛṣabhásya* in st. 11. The commentator at TB. i. 5. 1. 2 explains *rudantaḥ* by *bradhnavaḥ*, an obvious corruption of *bandhavaḥ* 'relatives,' and the temptation to regard the situation as derived from the funeral practices arises, owing to the presence of crying relatives and the manes. But the words *pitṝṇām maghāḥ* can not refer to the funeral: the constellation *maghāḥ* (*aghāḥ*), as may be seen from RV. x. 85. 13; AV. xiv. 1. 13 (Kāuç. 75. 5); Āpast. Gṛ. 1. 3. 1, 2, pertains, along with the two pairs of *phalgunī*, to the wedding ceremony. The passage in the AV. and Kāuç. is *maghâsu hanyante gávaḥ phálgunīṣu vyúhyate* 'under the constellation *magha* the cows are slain; under the two *phalgunī* the marriage procession is

[1] For the meaning of *parastād* and *avastād* see the commentator on i. 5. 1. 1 (p. 204); i. 5. 3. 4 (p. 219); and Weber, Die vedischen Nachrichten von den Naksatra (Abhandlungen der Kōniglichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, 1862), II, p. 386.

[2] For this stanza, surely a wedding stanza, see AJPh. XVII 406. The commentator at TB. glosses, *apabhraṅço dehapātaḥ*.

Digitized by Google

held.' Similarly Āpastamba. The cows which are slain are, doubtless, those which are prepared in the *arghya* ceremony, when welcome is extended to the groom, or during some preparatory festival prior to the marriage proper. The wording of RV. x. 85. 13 is *aghāsu hanyante gāvó 'rjunyoḥ páry uhyate*; according to ÇB. ii. 1. 2. 11 *arjunī* = *phalgunī* and *agha* is obviously the same as *magha*. Cf. Weber, ib., p. 364 ff. Equally clear is Rāmāy. i. 71. 24: *maghā hy adya mahābāho tṛtīye divase prabho, phālguṇyām uttare* (!) *rājan tasmin* (!) *vāivāhikaṁ kuru*, 'to-day are the *maghāḥ*, O great-armed lord! The day after to-morrow, O king, under the constellation *uttare phalgunī*, prepare the wedding.' Cf. also Rāmāy. i. 72. 13.

The consecration of the constellation *magha* to the Fathers is after all natural, since they are especially interested in marriage, or rather in its hoped-for consequences, the production of sons who shall perform the *çrāddha* necessary for the subsistence of the spirits of the departed; cf. *vāmáṁ pitṛ́bhyo yá idáṁ samerirẹ́* in RV. x. 40. 10 (see below). The presence of Aryaman and Bhaga also indicates that this is the light in which the *pitars* are here to be regarded. It is to be noted, too, that *maghāḥ* is a *puṇyaṁ* ('holy, auspicious') *nakṣatram* (TB. i. 5. 2. 7), or *mṛdu nakṣatram* (Jyotiṣam v. 11; see Weber, ib., p. 384),[1] as is suggested by its very name.

Another point which advances the understanding of the stanza markedly is the recognition that *jīva* is a technical term. It does not here signify merely 'a living person,' in distinction to a deceased one (*mṛta*), as it does numberless times in the Mantras, but rather a *jīva* in his relations to the *pitar*, in his function as provider of the Çrāddhas for the Fathers; *jīvaṁ* in pāda 1 is contrasted with *pitṛ́ṣu* in pāda 3. This follows especially from a passage VS. xix. 45, 46; MS. iii. 11. 11 (156. 11–14); ÇB. xii. 8. 1. 19, 20; TB. ii. 6. 3. 4, 5; Āpast. Çr. i. 9. 12; 10. 12; Çāṅkh. Gṛ. v. 9. 4; Kāuç. 89. 1 (cf. AV. xviii. 2. 52; MS. i. 10. 3 [143. 6]; Āçv. Çr. ii. 7. 7). The passage according to the text of VS. is as follows:

[1] In other secondary texts, to be sure, *maghā* is counted as *krūra* or *ugra*, but this is doubtless due to secondary reasoning, based upon the fact that the constellation is consecrated to the manes, or that the cattle in honor of the bridegroom is slain under it; cf. Weber, ibid., p. 385. With this kind of conception we must connect the variant form *aghā* (*agha* 'evil') in RV. x. 85. 13.

Digitized by Google

ye samānāḥ samanasaḥ pitaro yamarājye:
teṣāṁ lokaḥ svadhā namo yajño deveṣu kalpatām.
ye samānāḥ samanaso jīvā jīveṣu māmakāḥ:
teṣāṁ çrīr mayi kalpatām asmiṁ loke çataṁ samāḥ.

Mahīdhara glosses VS. xix. 46 most excellently: . . . *jīveṣu prāṇiṣu madhye ye samānāḥ samanasaḥ samanaskāḥ māmakā madīyā jīvāḥ prāṇinaḥ, sapiṇḍāḥ ye me te māmakāḥ.* Mahīdhara's translation of the word *jīva* by *sapiṇḍa* again suggests descendants through marriage (cf. also ÇB. xiii. 8. 1. 9; 4. 12); the act of wailing over a living descendant is so singular that we may well consider Haradatta's words in explanation of the stanza, as quoted by Winternitz, ib., p. 42: 'they wail over the living one . . . instead of rejoicing the relatives cry.' The extraordinary character of this proceeding is brought out well by the position of the word *jīvam* contrasted with *rudanti* at the beginning of the sentence, and I can not, for my part, doubt that the widespread custom of wailing over the bridegroom, or, according to another view of the same situation, over the bride (see the Sūtras of the Black Yajus), is thus proved as ancient as the Mantras (see Winternitz, ib.).

The second pāda of our stanza, *dīrghám ánu prásitiṁ dīdhiyur náraḥ*, has also called out numerous renderings, as may be seen from the translations reported above.[1] A formula much like this pāda occurs in a considerable variety of forms in the Yajus texts. Thus: VS. i. 20; ÇB. i. 2. 1. 19, 21; Kāty. Çr. ii. 5. 7; TS. i. 1. 6. 1; TB. iii. 2. 6. 4; Āpast. Çr. i. 21. 7, *dīrghām anu prasitim āyuṣe dhām*; MS. i. 1. 7; iv. 1. 7; Mān. Çr. i. 2. 2. 30, *dīrghām anu prasṛtiṁ samspṛçethām āyuṣe vaḥ*; and in the Kāṭhaka-Saṁhitā i. 6, *dīrghām anu samṛtim āyuṣe dhām*. In TB., loc. cit., and MS. iv. 1. 7, these formulas are said to bestow long life upon the sacrificer. The word *prasiti* means 'continuance,' as may be seen most clearly in RV. iv. 22. 7, where Indra is said to have freed the waters, *dīrghám ánu prásitiṁ syandayádhyāi*, 'to flow in long continuance.' The expression *dīrghām anu prasitim* is obviously idiomatic; the word *anu* does not, as the lexicons assume, go with *dīdhiyur* in RV. x. 40. 10, any more than with

[1] Sāyaṇa ludicrously: *tāsu* (sc. *jāyāsu*) *dīrghāṁ mahatīṁ prasitiṁ bhujayoḥ prabandhanaṁ dīdhiyur anudadhati*. He thinks of 'long-armed marital embraces,' and he is correct at least in supposing that the pāda alludes in some way to marriage.

Digitized by Google

syandayadhyāi in iv. 22. 7, or with *dhām* in the Yajus-saṁhitās. The idiom means 'during a long stretch, or during a long time.' The words *dīdhiyur naraḥ* are explained by the parallel passage RV. vii. 91. 4:

yāvat tāras tanvò yāvad ójo
yāvan náraç çákṣasā dīdhyānāḥ:
çúciṁ sómaṁ çucipā pātam asmé, etc.

'As long as the activity and the strength of (our) bodies endures, as long as the men see with their sight (or think with their minds; cf. RV. x. 130. 6), do ye (Indra and Vāyu), the drinkers of the pure drink, drink the pure soma with us, etc.' Here the *naraḥ dīdhyānāḥ* are men exercising some important function of life, and that, too, in a spiritual, or religious, sense; accordingly, the pāda in RV. x. 40. 10 is to be translated 'the men have thought (lived religiously) for a long stretch of time.' Or if we regard *dīdhiyur* as an injunctive of a preterit present (cf. Grassmann, under root *dhī*), 'may the men live piously a long time.' In a wedding stanza this can only refer either to the ascetic life of the Aryan during his disciplehood before marriage, or to the pious life of the householder about to be inaugurated with his marriage.

In contrast with the vagueness of the first hemistich, the second hemistich need not hereafter occasion any doubt. The sense of pāda 3 is that the Fathers (manes) are profoundly interested in the marriage of their posterity on earth, because upon them depends the continuance of the *çrāddha*-offerings. Hence they attend (hover about in spirit) with delight every wedding of their descendants.[1] Render: 'a pleasure to the Fathers are they that have congregated here.' AV. xiv. 2. 73 reads:

yé pitáro vadhūdarçā imáṁ vahatúm āgaman
té asyāi vadhvāi sáṁpatnyāi prajāvac chárma yachantu.

'The Fathers that have come to this wedding to inspect the bride shall bestow upon this bride and her husband protection and offspring.' And the fourth pāda of RV. x. 40. 10 continues: 'A joy to husbands are wives to embrace.'

Unquestionably, the stanza as a whole is a rather dithyrambic statement of events and moods at a wedding: 'They bewail the

[1] In a later view these are the 'joy-faced Fathers' (*nāndīmukha*) that are supposed to be present at many auspicious family happenings, weddings among others. See the texts cited by Hillebrandt, Ritual-Litteratur, §57.

Digitized by Google

living, (yet) rejoice at the feast.[1] For a long time the men have lived (or, shall live) their pious lives. A delight to the Fathers are they that have congregated here; a joy to husbands wives to embrace.' In the AV. the verse occurs in a miscellaneous collection of wedding stanzas; in the RV. it appears in its legitimate connection. Ghoṣā, a princess, somewhat superannuated, yet desiring a husband, is known to have appealed to the Açvins for succor. The Açvins, according to the myth elsewhere, granted her request—one of the noteworthy achievements for which the Açvins are praised (RV. i. 117. 7, 19; x. 40. 5). In the first eight stanzas of RV. x. 40 the Açvins are called; their many wonderful and helpful deeds are recited. In st. 5 the story of Ghoṣā is alluded to. Beginning with st. 9 some one, probably he for whom and in whose pay the poet sings this wedding hymn, is described as being in the act of marrying (*asmā áhne bhavati tát patitvanám*). That st. 9 describes very poetically a beautiful and auspicious wedding-morn I have shown elsewhere.[2] St. 10 has just been treated. That st. 11 ff. continues with wedding motives scarcely needs stating: 11. 'We do not understand this: do ye then tell us clearly, how the youth dwells in the lap of the maid. Let us go to the house of a lusty bull that delights in cows. That, O ye Açvins, we do crave.' The lusty bull is the *beau ideal* of people interested in these pursuits.

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD.

[1] Of course, the rendering of *ví mayante adhvaré* is mere guesswork, because *ví mayante* (AV. *ví nayante*) is in effect a ἅπ. λεγ. I have connected *mayante* with the noun *mâyas*.

[2] This Journal, XVII 406.

Digitized by Google

V.—THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE LETTERS OF CICERO TO ATTICUS IN THE VATICAN LIBRARY.

There are in the Vatican Library fourteen MSS of the Letters of Cicero to Atticus, viz. Vaticani 1691, 1692, 2878, 2879, 3249, 3250; Palatini 1495, 1508, 1509, 1510; Ottoboniani 1413, 2035, 2041; and Urbinas 322. Of these, Lehmann collated the last and pronounced judgment upon it (De Ciceronis ad Atticum epistulis recensendis et emendandis, pp. 42–4). He also reports that he had investigated Vatt. 1691, 1692, and Ottob. 1413, and found them to be "codices omnes simillimi Medicei et s (Urb. 322)." It is proposed in this paper to describe together all of these MSS now in the Vatican.

It may be stated at the outset that this number of MSS of the Letters to Atticus is far exceeded by that of the Epistulae ad Familiares, of which there are 57, containing all or part of the letters.[1]

I. *Codex Palatinus* 1495.—This is a parchment MS of the XVth century, in folio, having 184 leaves measuring 35 by 24 centimetres, and with 34 lines on a page. It is finely written and well preserved, with illuminated capitals at the beginning of each book and simple capitals at the beginning of each letter. The Greek words are almost always omitted, but space has usually been left for them in the text, and there are few glosses. In the letters to Brutus and Quintus, the Greek words have sometimes been inserted by another hand. In the first 30 folia there are a few corrections.

The MS contains:

1r–1or, epp. ad Brutum liber I.

1or–32r, epp. ad Q. fratr. libri III.

32r–34r, ep. ad Octavianum.

[1] Vatt. 1494, 1495, 1684–1690, 1692, 1751, 1755, 8088, 9367; Palatt. 492, 496, 598, 607, 1496–1507, 1707, 1741; Ottobb. 1036, 1176, 1230, 1295, 1510, 1512, 1615, 1709, 1756, 1828, 1851, 2037, 2144, 2419, 2992; Urbb. 313, 316; Cappon. 15; Regg. 1532, 1626, 1657, 1696, 1778, 1871, 1876. Epp. ad Q. fratr., Ottobb. 1267, 1504.

Digitized by Google

34r–184, epp. ad Atticum libri XVI, with the same lacuna (I 18. 1–19. 11) as the Codex Mediceus.

A comparison of the test readings employed by Lehmann in the above-mentioned monograph, pp. 45–9, to determine the relation between MSS of the Σ and Δ classes, and which number 78, taken from all parts of the letters, shows that, with perhaps four minor and wholly unimportant variations, Pal. 1495 agrees perfectly with Δ, and is therefore a mere copy of M, having no independent value.

II. *Codex Palatinus* 1508.—This is a parchment MS of the XVth century, in folio, having 248 leaves measuring 27 by 17 centimetres, and with 32 lines on a page. It is exceedingly well written, in a hand which has a somewhat more pronounced tendency towards the cursive than is usually the case at this period. There are illuminations at the beginnings of the books, and capitals at the beginning of the letters, set in the margin. The Greek words are written out in the text in the first hand, and there are no glosses. A few corrections have also been made by the first hand. On a blank page is written: "Hic liber est Alexandri Necosansis f(or s)anestris."

The MS contains:

1v–15r, epp. ad Brutum liber I.

15r–45v, epp. ad Q. fratr. libri III.

45v–48r, ep. ad Octavianum.

48r–248r, epp. ad Atticum libri XVI. Bk. I is complete, but bk. XVI ends with non serventur 16B. 8.

248v, ep. Plutarchi ad Traianum.

The numbering of the books runs from the beginning, so that ad Brutum I is called ad Atticum I, and ad Atticum I appears as V.

An examination of the test readings shows that this MS agrees with Σ against Δ in only the following cases: I 3. 3 hoc <eo> ad te, Δ hoc [eo] ad te; II 1. 1 laetatus sum <me> aliquanto, Δ laetatus sum [me] aliquanto; IV 12 esse <idibus> enim, Δ esse [idibus] enim; V 20. 3 discessimus <interim> scis enim, Δ discessimus [interim] scis enim; VI 7. 2 sed <plane> volo, Δ sed [plane] volo; XIII 9. 1 <Dolabella . . . diligentissime quae>, Δ *om.*; 10. 3 Brutus si quid <egerit>, Δ Brutus si quid [egerit]; 24 Ciceronem vidisse Corcyrae, Δ Ciceronem vidisse currere; XIV 13b. 5 animus tuus <mihi> magis patuit, Δ animus tuus [mihi] magis patuit.

Digitized by Google

In all but one of these nine cases, the variation consists of the presence of a word or words omitted in M. In three cases this MS has readings different from both Σ and Δ, but of no importance. These few agreements with Σ and the fact that the M lacuna in bk. I does not occur, would seem to show that the MS presents the M tradition, but with interpolations from Σ.

III. *Codex Palatinus* 1509.—This is a paper MS of the end of the XVth or beginning of the XVIth century, in folio, having 210 leaves measuring 19 by 28.5 centimetres, and with 31 lines on a page. It is well written and preserved, the hand being somewhat like that of the preceding MS. The different books begin with scrolls in the margin, and the letters with colored capitals. The Greek words are written in the text by the first hand, with glosses over them in red ink. On the blank page at the beginning we read: "hunc librum Gruterus in collectione sua vocat Palatinum tertium."

The MS contains:

1r–13r, epp. ad Brutum liber I.

13r–14v, ep. ad Octavianum.

15r–42r, epp. ad Q. fratr. libri III.

42r–210v, epp. ad Atticum libri XVI. Bk. I is complete, but XVI 16C, E, F are lacking.

On examining the test passages of the first seven books, it is found that this MS agrees with Σ against Δ in I 3. 3; 6. 1; II 1. 1; IV 12; VI 72, and that there is no lacuna in bk. I. It appears then that this MS is entirely similar in origin to the previous one, Pal. 1508, though probably somewhat later. A few mistakes in 1508 have been corrected in 1509, and in XII 3. 2, where both MSS omit the last three lines of the letter (sed ludis . . . plurimam), 1509 adds "vale. me ut fecisti semper ama."

We have then interpolations of this sort in a text which is itself copied from a contaminated original, and we can attach no value to the MS.

IV. *Codex Palatinus* 1510.—This is a paper MS of the late XVth or early XVIth century, in folio, having 129 leaves measuring 33 by 23 centimetres, and having 28 lines on a page. It is also well written and preserved. The separate books begin with large, and the letters with small, colored capitals. The Greek words are wanting, but space has regularly been left for them,

Digitized by Google

and there are no glosses. On the first leaf is written: "Palatinus quartus dicitur in collectione Gruteri."

The MS contains:

1r–18r, epp. ad Brutum liber I.

18r–58r, epp. ad Q. fratr. libri III.

58r–60v, ep. ad Octavianum.

61r–129r, epp. ad Atticum libri I–III; IV 1–4, 14, 16. 1–4. 10–12, 18. 1–3 with the loss of two or three lines; V 1–8, 10; IX 2, 3, 4, 6. 4–6A.

An examination of the readings of this MS shows that it agrees in *every* case with the Σ class against Δ, and therefore represents faithfully the non-Medicean tradition. In view of the small number of these MSS as yet known, it has some independent value, and its fragmentary condition is to be greatly regretted. A complete collation is most desirable.

V. *Codex Vaticanus* 1691.—This is a parchment MS in folio, having 251 leaves measuring 31 by 21 centimetres, and with 33 lines on a page. From its close resemblance to 1692, it was probably written in Florence about 1475. It has the usual illuminations at the beginning of the books and capitals at the beginning of the letters.

The MS contains: epp. ad Brutum liber I; epp. ad Q. fratr. libri I 1–3. 3 (iocundum fuit), II; ep. ad Octavianum; ff. 47r–250r, epp. ad Atticum libri XVI, bk. I being complete.

VI. *Codex Vaticanus* 1692.—This is also a parchment MS in folio, having 325 leaves measuring 37.5 by 26 centimetres, and with 36 lines on a page. There are the same illuminations and capitals as in No. 1691. On the first blank page is written: "Scriptus fuit florentie. Vespasianus librarius transcribere fecit" (circa 1475).

The MS contains: epp. ad Brutum liber I; epp. ad Q. fratr. libri III; ep. ad Octavianum; ff. 35r–180v, epp. ad Atticum libri XVI, with no lacuna in bk. I, but bk. XVI ends with 16B. 8 (serventur magnam).

As Lehmann (op. cit., p. 45) had examined these last two MSS and reported them "simillimi Medicei et s," any further investigation was of course unnecessary, although it was made.

VII. *Codex Vaticanus* 2878.—This is a paper MS of the XVth century, in folio, having 170 leaves measuring 29 by 21 centi-

Digitized by Google

metres, and with some difference in the number of lines on a page. The writing is of two styles, the first extending over 83 leaves and being an inferior bookhand with a tendency to flourishes and cursive elements. This is also, apparently, the work of more than one scribe. The second style is that of a fine bookhand, which fills the rest of the MS. In the first 83 leaves there are 38 or 39 lines on each page, while throughout the second hand there are 46. All the letters are separated by the salutations written out in capitals. The Greek words are wanting, and there are no glosses of any sort.

The MS contains:

1r–12v, epp. ad Brutum liber I, omitting 1–3. 1 (certe nisi).

12v–43r, epp. ad Q. fratr. libri III.

43v–45v, ep. ad Octavianum.

46r–170v, epp. ad Atticum libri XVI, with the following lacunae: I 18. 1 reperire ex magna—20. 1 cum Pompeiano (the M lacuna); III 2, 8; XV 21. 3 aliquid—16. 1; XVI 3. 5 nomina—6. 2 revocat me; 16A. 6 velle intellexeram to end of book.

There is also much confusion in the text of the later books. An examination of this MS shows that it too belongs exclusively to the Medicean family and has no independent value.

VIII. *Codex Vaticanus* 2879.—This is a parchment MS of the XVth century, in folio, having 87 leaves. Spaces have been left at the beginning of each letter for colored capitals, but none have been made. The Greek words are wanting, but spaces have regularly been left for them. There are no glosses, but a few corrections and notes in the margin.

The MS contains:

1r–17v, epp. ad Brutum liber I.

18r–58v, epp. ad Q. fratr. libri III.

58v–61v, ep. ad Octavianum.

62v–87v, epp. ad Atticum libri I, II 1–4. 5 perspeximus nostra.

In this small fragment of the Letters to Atticus all the readings are those of M.

IX. *Codex Vaticanus* 3249.—This is a parchment MS of the XVth century, having 160 leaves measuring 29 by 21 centimetres, and with 29 lines on a page, and exceedingly well written. There are illuminations at the beginning of each book and colored capitals at the beginning of the letters. The Greek words are

Digitized by Google

inserted in red ink, with glosses in the margin, in the first hand, M^1. The corrections in the text and margin are in a later hand, M^2.

The MS contains:

1r–15v, epp. ad Brutum liber I.

15v–49v, epp. ad Q. fratr. libri III.

49v–51v, ep. ad Octavianum.

52r–160, epp. ad Atticum libri I–VIII 12D. 2 verbis committendum sit.

The text agrees in all the test passages with Δ except in I 20. 1 dederas et nunc epistolae, and II 1. 5 plebeiorum, which are Σ readings. In both these places corrections have been made by M^2, and they are the Δ readings. In four cases—I 2. 2 Ianuario mense, 3. 3 hoc [eo] ad, 5. 4 duxi scribere, 6. 1 par [in hoc]—the original Δ reading of the text has been corrected by M^2 into the Σ form, viz. ianuario ineunte, hoc <eo> ad, duxi rescribere, par <in hoc>. This is a somewhat curious combination. The MS manifestly belongs to the Medicean family, but the corrector had access to some MS of the Σ class of which, however, he made but sparing use. It is probable too that the MS from which this was copied had been emended already from Σ.

X. *Codex Vaticanus* 3250.—This is a parchment MS of the XVth century, in folio, having 253 leaves measuring 30.5 by 19 centimetres, and with 30 lines on a page. It is well written, with illuminated capitals at the beginning of the books and simple capitals at the beginning of the letters. The Greek words are written in the text in the scribe's hand, and some of the glosses. There are then numerous glosses of both the Greek words and others, as well as corrections, in black ink, in the hand of the editor (Salicetus or Regius, see below), and, further, some corrections and glosses, in red ink, in what is possibly a third hand, although it is difficult to speak with certainty.

The MS contains:

1r–13r, epp. ad Brutum liber I.

13r–44r, epp. ad Q. fratr. libri III.

44r–46r, ep. ad Octavianum.

46r–253r, epp. ad Atticum libri XVI, complete in bk. I.

By way of preface we find the following dedicatory letter:—

Salicetus Bononiensis et Ludovicus Regius Corneliensis Augustino Maffeo. Ecce studiosissime litterarum cultor Augustine,

Digitized by Google

volumina epistolarum M. Tullii ad M. Brutum, Q. Ciceronem fratrem et T. Pomponium Atticum, tibi ut morem gereremus, recognovimus. Mendosissimumque codicem utpote indignum qui sic inter lectissimos tuos numeraretur, quantum fieri tantis in tenebris potuit castigatione subiecimus, recognitione etiam bis repetita variisque adiuta exemplaribus. Opus sane operosum et plenum difficultatis quam nec obsequendi tibi cupido potuit, nec pervigil cura vincere. Progredi enim necesse fuit a priore epistola usque ad extremum suspenso pede, velut inter sentes ac rubos. Adeo nullus prope versiculus fuit vitio carens, quippe qui exscripsit, ultro mendis iisse videtur obviam. Nec satis est aestimare maius ne illi fuerit Ciceronis scripta depravandi studium an perdendi membranas. Quod facere solent Librarii, quom vel minus iusta iis proposita est laboris merces, vel eorum segnior manus accusatur. Tunc enim maxime peccat velocitas; et quantum a tarditate discessit tantum adhaerit mendae. Horum igitur librariorum incuria vel potius conatu praecipiti, effectum est ut epistolarum ad Atticum ea minor sit pars quae melior. Et ut fateamur ingenue per quos proficiamus, Iacobo Card. Papien. et Ioanni Episcopo Alariensi viris nostra aetate doctissimis decet acceptum ferre quicquid lucis in his datur cernere. Illi enim ex sudato diu labore quamquam non plenam attulerint, pro beneficio tamen habendum est quominus multo per eos hallucinamur. Quare si quod legendo non planum obscurumve offendes, neglegentiae nostrae ne tribuas. Illos tibi proponas a quorum vestigiis ne transversum quidem unguem digressi sumus. Non enim fuit propositum emendare prorsus epistolas secretioribus perscriptas notis quarum haud scimus an satis ex primis Ciceronis Archtypis [*sic*] possent erui sensa. Illud profecto miramur, cum extet locupletissimum Corneli Nepotis testimonium de his ad Atticum libris, quos undecim fuisse tantummodo refert, quo pacto posterioribus aevi numerosior distinctio fit. Ad sexdecim enim excrevere. Cur non idem libris de Gloria, de re. p., de minuendo dolore contigit? Non idem quoque Laudatione Catonis, Commentariis consulatus, Poematis graece et latine scriptis? Quorum ne sceda quidem brevior ad nostros devenit atavos. Ridenda sane res, undecim hos peperisse quinque, cum de tot Ciceronis aequalium ipsius scilicet Pomponii Sallustii Varronis ac minorum Livii Curtii Taciti multorumque praeterea thesauris maior pars perierit. Caeterum nec suspicari possumus in iisdem epistolis et caeteris ad Lentulum unde sit tanta perversio. Pleraeque enim praeposterae,

Digitized by Google

indigestae promiscuae, tamen cumulatae. Quod si qui eas emiserunt ac emendare conati sunt recte animadvertissent, rationeque temporum habita, dedissent suum cuique locum, minor esset profecto universae synagogae difficultas. Sed haec tu legens aestimabis facilius. Et si quid ex facultate intelligendi deerit, id tuo demes ex desiderio. Compensari poterit cum hoc obscuritatis incommodo beneficium cognitionis tot rerum dignarum, quot sive dicendi caracterem exquisitissimum, sive Atticos et urbanos sales requiris raro alibi legisse fatebere. Et tu Cornelii ipsius Nepotis utamur verbis contextam [*sic*], si haec leges temporum illorum historiam non multum desiderabis. Cave existimes ad imitandum utiliorem Caecilium alii Senecam et caeteros id genus in delitiis habeant. Quos quidem non improbamus. Unicuique enim sponsam suam. Sed quemadmodum illos illi legendos amandosque sibi proponunt, ita nobis concedant ut hunc perpetuo habeamus in manibus. Non opere pretium est sigillatim exequi in quibus hic praestet ne praescriptione nostra Ciceronis laus altero Cicerone egens minuatur. Caeterum is tibi fuit ab ineunte aetate studiorum amore ut haec longe melius expendisse te existemus quam nos attigisse. Tantummodo scire te volumus attente nos loquentem cum Attico Ciceronem audisse, et exemplariorum fidelem fecisse collationem quod etiam stigmosa pagina lituraque multa indicabit. Nobis certe corruptionis tollendae excerpendarumque adnotationum maior cura fuit, quam servandi candorem marginibus. Caeteri codices in speciosissima tua supellectili castitate et nitore se tuebantur ab illotis manibus,—hic amissis decore et specie nec assiduos usus vitabit nec ullius contactum refugiet. Vale et quas habes fortunas animi bonis iunctas tibi Deus perpetuet!

Of these two scholars to whom the editors express their special indebtedness, the first-named appears to have been Jacopo Piccolomini, who was born in 1422, became Bishop of Pavia in 1460, and Cardinal the next year. In 1477 he was translated to the Bishopric of Frascati, and died in 1479. The second, Ioannes Antonius de Buxiis, sometimes wrongly named Ioannes Andreas, Bishop of Aleria, was a noted scholar of the period, who died in 1475, and whose monument is in S. Pietro in Vincoli at Rome. A letter from this same scholar to Pope Paul II is prefixed to the editio princeps of the Letters to Atticus published in Rome and Venice in 1470. From the way in which the editors speak of these two men and of their assistance in revising the text, it

Digitized by Google

would certainly be inferred that they were at the time incumbents of the offices named in their titles, and hence that the MS was written between 1461 and 1475.

There is in the Vatican Library an early edition of the Letters to Atticus which was, until two years ago, placed among the MSS and numbered *Codex Ottobonianus* 1711. At the beginning of this book we find the same dedicatory letter which has just been quoted from Cod. Vat. 3250. It begins: Bartholomaeus Salicetus Bononiensis et Ludovicus Regius Corneliensis Augustino Maffeo S., and then continues as above, except for a few unimportant verbal changes and the omission of the paragraphs "Caeterum nec suspicari—demes ex desiderio" and "vaticinationemque—plane deprehendes." At the end of the volume is printed the following letter:

Augustino Maphaeo Ludovicus Regius Corneliensis Patrono benemerenti S. Non te praeterit, unice ac studiosissime Romanarum rerum illustrator et vindex Augustine, quantum operae laboris atque industriae superiore anno impenderimus, ut mendosissimum tuum Codicem epistolarum ad T. P. Atticum, quem pro maximis tuis erga nos et innumerabilibus beneficiis, tuo tamen iussu, recognoscendum suscaeperamus, tibi accuratissime castigatum omnique ex parte integrum redderemus. Quod quidem assequi nobis cupidissime optantibus non modo non licuit, verumetiam in tanta omnium quaecumque ad manus nostras provenerunt exemplariorum corruptione vel confusione potius (provenere autem quam plurima et varia) id ipsum vel optare vel in spe ponere, vix hercle liberum aut sanae mentis fuit. Nos tamen quantum pervigili cura et assiduo vehementique studio tantis in tenebris atque erroribus efficere potuimus, Codicem ipsum tuum supra quam dici possit inculcatum et undique depravatum recognitione tunc bis repetita paulo apertiorem et candidiorem reddidimus. In quo videlicet cum spei tuae non mediocriter (ut tibi visum est) nobis vero non ex integro satisfecerimus. Cumque praeterea intelligeres has divinas M. T. Ciceronis Epistolas iam diu neglegenter in tanta librorum omnium ubertate suppressas, ab omnibus literarum cultoribus avidissime et quodam quasi convicio quotidie efflagitari, non es passus diutius in hoc desiderio et iustissima cupiditate laborare studiosos. Itaque sub tuo Archetypo nostra cura recognito, circiter octingenta volumina Romani Bibliopolae te libente et cohortante imprimenda curarunt, quo scilicet

Digitized by Google

Ciceronianae facundiae Cultores ex hoc divino Epistolarum cumulo tanquam ex uberrimo fonte dicendi copiam et facultatem una cum multarum rerum cognitione sibi facilius comparare possent, et tua nihilominus peculiaris illa liberalitas qua omnes Romanae Achademiae claros viros et ingenia studiosorum cum summa laude quotidie foves et amplecteris, apud caeteros quoque bonarum literarum sectatores magis et magis inclaresceret. Cui provinciae cum nos qui omnia tibi debere fatemur ingenue praeficiendos esse volueris, omni qua potuimus vigilantia et conatu perpetuo curavimus, ut nulla pagina imprimeretur quae non prius esset a nobis ociose et pensiculate regustata. Verum cum in toto volumine multas partes adeo vitiosas et mutilatas offenderimus, ut nulla nec cura nec assiduo labore sanari et in integrum restitui potuerint, operae precium fore putavimus, id imprimis curare, ut loci vel librariorum indiligentia vel temporum vitia sic passim depravati et corrupti quicque adeo essent paulo obscuriores Asteriscis in omnibus voluminibus notarentur minusculis, quo perspicatiora in iis enodandis ac rectius corrigendis ingenia se deinceps pro ocium cum aliqua voluptate valeant exercere, et quod nobis propter rei difficultatem ac fidelium quoque exemplariorum inopiam, prorsus facere non licuit, omnia candidiora et apertiora reddere. . . . Vale.

I can find no further information about this Ludovicus Regius Corneliensis. We should of course identify Bartholomaeus Silicetus Bononiensis with the famous jurisconsult of Bologna, if the latter had not died in 1412.

Augustinus Maffeus might perhaps be the distinguished citizen of Verona who had, at the beginning of the XVIth century, made quite a large collection of Roman antiquities, if Cod. Ott. 3250 was really written as late as 1489 (see below).

On the last page is a Latin epigram addressed to Augustinus Maphaeus by Pomponius Laetus, and at the bottom: "Impressa Romae per Magistrum Eucharium Silber alias Franck natione Alemannum: Anno domini MCCCCLXXXX post kal. Augusti." This edition, then, was printed at Rome in 1490. The corrections and glosses are in red and black ink, in the same hand as most of those in Cod. Vat. 3250, i. e. the hand of the editor, either Bartholomaeus Salicetus or Ludovicus Regius. Schweiger describes another edition similar to this in every respect, with the same introductory letter and the epigram of Pomponius Laetus, but without place or date. They are practically the same edition.

Digitized by Google

From what is said in these letters and from the identity of the correctors' hands, we are justified in inferring that Cod. Vat. 3250 is the "mendosissimum Codicem" which served as copy for the printed edition, and further, according to Ludovicus' statement, that the MS itself was written "superiore anno"—that is, in 1489, if the date given on the last page is really the date of the first appearance of this edition. The fact that the undated edition just mentioned is apparently the same, raises a suspicion as to the truth of the "superiore anno." If the MS was written in 1489, Iacobus Cardinalis Papiensis and Ioannes Episcopus Aleriensis had both been dead for some years, and the way in which they are spoken of is misleading. If they were still alive, the MS must date before 1475, and "superiore anno" is wrong.

As regards the text of the MS, it appears that it reproduces for the most part the Medicean, but with an admixture of Σ, and that the editors, in making corrections, had before them MSS of the Σ class. For example, out of 37 test passages, the scribe followed M in 32 and Σ in 5, but in 8 instances more the corrector has inserted the Σ readings. The MS is undoubtedly of some value in helping us to trace out the commingling of the two traditions, and because of its connection with these two early Roman editions.

XI. *Codex Urbinas* 322.—This is a parchment MS of the XVth century, in folio, having 238 leaves measuring 35 by 24 centimetres, and with 34 lines on a page. It is admirably written, with illuminations at the beginning of the books and colored capitals at the beginning of the letters. The Greek words inserted in the text, in red ink, and the glosses in the margin are in the same hand as the text, but slightly smaller. In those cases where the Greek is omitted, space has usually been left.

The MS contains:

1r–13r, epp. ad Brutum liber I.

13r–42r, epp. ad Q. fratr. libri III.

43r–44v, ep. ad Octavianum.

45r–238, epp. ad Atticum libri XVI, complete in bk. I.

For a collation of this MS see Lehmann, pp. 43–4. His conclusion is as follows: "s (i. e. cod. Urb. 322) cum simillimus codicis Medicei, non tot aut tam gravibus lectionibus cum C, Z, W consentit quam E, N, H, O, R, P = Σ; cum vero s multis neque levibus lectionibus cum Σ consentiat, Σ vero non pendeat ex M, s quoque sui iuris esse neque ex M ortum esse iudico: nisi

Digitized by Google

forte quis naturali quodam sensu interpolationes odorandi praeditus dicet, id quod non facile probari potest, parentem codicis Urbinatis esse ortum ex M, istum vero parentem, antequam s describeretur, ex Σ interpolationes accepisse." It is altogether probable that this second alternative is the true one, but "non facile probari potest."

XII. *Codex Ottobonianus* 1413.—This is a parchment MS of the XVth century, in small folio, having 273 leaves measuring 25 by 17 centimetres, and with 30 lines on a page. At the beginning of each book and letter, space has been left for illuminations and capitals, which have never been filled in. The Greek words are usually wanting, but in a few cases they have been inserted by a later hand. There are no glosses.

The MS contains:

1r–16r, epp. ad Brutum liber I.

16r–51v, epp. ad Q. fratr. libri III.

51v–54r, ep. ad Octavianum.

54r–272v, epp. ad Atticum libri XVI, complete in bk. I.

272v, ep. Philippi ad Aristotelem.

273r, ep. Plutarchi ad Traianum.

An examination of this MS confirms Lehmann's judgment (p. 45) "simillimus Medicei," in spite of the absence of the Medicean lacuna in bk. I, and shows its entire lack of independent value.

XIII. *Codex Ottobonianus* 2035.—This is a paper MS of the end of the XVth or early XVIth century, having 192 leaves measuring 28 by 21 centimetres, and with 34 lines on a page. The writing is only mediocre. The Greek words have regularly been inserted in a hand which is either that of the scribe or of the same time. In the few cases where the Greek has been omitted, space has been left. There are many glosses both of the Greek words and of others, which date from about the same period, but were written in a different ink, which has faded badly.

According to the Inventarium, "in fine legitur, 'Liber Augustini Maffei,'" but this line is not now to be found.

The MS contains:

1r–10r, ep. ad Brutum liber I.

10r–35r, epp. ad Q. fratr. libri III.

35r–36v, ep. ad Octavianum.

Digitized by Google

37r–192r, epp. ad Atticum libri XVI, complete in bk. I.

The readings in the test passages in this MS agree in every case with Δ except one: II 1. 5 duxi rescribere (Σ) instead of duxi scribere (Δ); and a very few and absolutely unimportant cases where the MS varies slightly from both Δ and Σ.

XIV. *Codex Ottobonianus* 2041.—This is a paper MS of the same period as the preceding, having 246 leaves measuring 35 by 24 centimetres, and with 32 lines on a page. It is more carelessly written than No. 2035, and the colored capitals at the beginning of the letters have frequently been left unmade. The books are numbered from the beginning, so that the first book of the Letters to Atticus is numbered "ad Atticum V." Spaces have been left for the Greek words, which have only infrequently been inserted. There are many glosses, both of Greek and Latin words, and a few corrections in the margin by a probably somewhat later hand.

The MS contains:

2r–13v, epp. ad Brutum liber I.

13v–42v, epp. ad Q. fratr. libri III.

42v–234r, epp. ad Atticum libri XVI, complete in bk. I, but XVI 3–15 are missing, and the order in XVI 16ABCDEF is confused so that they run ABECFD.

234r–236r, ep. ad Octavianum.

236r–239r, vacant.

239r–245r, ex historiis latinis Corneli Nepotis Vita Pomponii Attici.

245v, ep. officialium studii Florentini ad Iohannem Lamolam. XIIII Iul. 1446.

246r, ep. Caroli Aretini ad eundem III kl. Aug. 1446.

This MS is precisely similar to No. 2035, agreeing with it even in its slight divergences from both Δ and Σ, and is of equal worthlessness.

Of these fourteen MSS in the Vatican, the only ones of importance are: Cod. Urb. 322, which represents a commingling of the two texts, but has an independent value; Cod. Vat. 3250, which, though an interpolated text, is of assistance in tracing out the course of these interpolations; and Cod. Pal. 1510, which belongs to the Σ class entirely.

SAMUEL BALL PLATNER.

Digitized by Google

VI.—NOTE ON ACHARNIANS 947.

Βοι. μέλλω γέ τοι θερίδδειν. 947
Χορ. ἀλλ' ὦ ξένων βέλτιστε σὺ
θέριζε καὶ τοῦτον λαβὼν
πρόσβαλλ' ὅποι βούλει φέρων
πρὸς πάντα συκοφάντην.

The use of the verb θερίζειν in Ach. 947 is peculiar, and the explanations hitherto offered are not satisfactory. The difficulty is no new one, for it is clear that the ancient commentators did not understand the passage. The following are the scholia:

μέλλω γέ τοι θερίδδειν: διότι πολλοῦ ἐθέριζον διὰ τὸν πόλεμον (Rutherford <οὐκ> ἐθέριζον).

μέλλω γέ τοι θερίδδειν: ὡς γεωργός φησι "μέλλω θερίζειν καὶ μέλλω κερδαίνειν πολλὰ καὶ καρποῦσθαι."

θερίδδειν: καταβάλλειν, ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς τῶν θεριζόντων ὅτι τὰ δράγματα τιθέασιν.

(τινὲς δέ φασι τὸν Δικαιόπολιν εἰρηκέναι, μέλλοντα λαβεῖν τὰ τοῦ Βοιωτοῦ φορτία.)

The writer of the first scholion seems to have taken θερίζειν in its common meaning of 'reap' or 'gather in a harvest.' In the second we are told that θερίζειν is equivalent to κερδαίνειν or καρποῦσθαι 'make a profit.' In the third the commentator has attempted to give to θερίζειν a meaning transferred from some action performed in the process of reaping. The fourth scholion, which is not in the Ravenna manuscript, throws no light upon the meaning of θερίζειν, but may indicate a distribution of the parts different from that adopted in our texts. Suidas, s. v. θερίζειν, merely repeats the first and third explanations of the scholiasts.

Many modern commentators are inclined to agree with the statement of the scholiast that θερίζειν is here equivalent to καρποῦσθαι, κερδαίνειν. Ribbeck and Müller do not hesitate to accept this explanation. Elmsley and Dindorf express themselves doubtfully. Elmsley suggests that the verb is used for εὖ πράττειν; Dindorf claims that it has the force of 'pack together,' *convasare*, and gives this definition in his Stephanus. Blaydes seems uncertain

Digitized by Google

whether to explain the verb as meaning 'pack up' or 'make a harvest,' 'make a good thing of this.' It is as difficult to believe that θερίζειν could come to mean 'pack up' as that it could mean 'throw down,' which one of the scholiasts gives as its equivalent. But in many languages verbs meaning 'to reap' or 'to harvest' are used with the sense of making a gain or profit. Let us then see if θερίζειν can be so used here.

Those who hold that θερίζειν here is equivalent to κερδαίνειν point in support of their claim to verses 905–6:

> Βοι. λάβοιμι μέντἂν κέρδος ἀγαγὼν καὶ πολύ,
> ὥπερ πίθακον ἀλιτρίας πολλᾶς πλέων.

and 956–8:

> Δικ. πάντως μὲν οἴσεις οὐδὲν ὑγιές, ἀλλ' ὅμως·
> κἂν τοῦτο κερδάνῃς ἄγων τὸ φορτίον,
> εὐδαιμονήσεις συκοφαντῶν γ' οὕνεκα.

These passages may show that the notion of making a profit would be in keeping with the context, but they give us no reason for introducing that notion into a word in which it does not belong. It is not necessary to find in l. 957 a reference to l. 947; it is sufficiently introduced by the line preceding.

Bearing this in mind, we proceed to examine the usage of the verb θερίζειν. In Aristophanes there are three other examples of it—Birds 506 and 1697, and Plutus 515; in all three places it has the common meaning 'reap,' 'harvest.' The verb is used metaphorically in Aesch. Suppl. 646 (Wecklein):

> Ἄρη
> τὸν ἀρότοις
> θερίζοντα βροτοὺς ἐν ἄλλοις,

and in the more general sense of 'cut off, shear off,' it appears in Soph. Ajax 237 and Tyro fr. 598 (Nauck), Eur. Suppl. 717. With a different application Euripides uses θερίζειν in the sense of 'cut off, bring to an end,' in Hypsipyle fr. 757:

> ἀναγκαίως δ' ἔχει
> βίον θερίζειν ὥστε κάρπιμον στάχυν . . .

which Cicero renders

> tum vita omnibus
> Metenda ut fruges. Sic iubet necessitas.

Digitized by Google

In Ino fr. 419 we have the passive construction, *βίος θερίζεται.*— More to our purpose is Plato, Phaedr. 260 D *ποῖόν τινα οἴει μετὰ ταῦτα τὴν ῥητορικὴν καρπὸν ὧν ἔσπειρε θερίζειν;* An elaboration of the same figure is censured by Aristotle (Rhet. III 3, p. 1406 b 5–10) as being too poetical. It is a quotation from Gorgias: *χλωρὰ καὶ ἔναιμα τὰ πράγματα· σὺ δὲ ταῦτα αἰσχρῶς μὲν ἔσπειρας, κακῶς δὲ ἐθέρισας.*

The use of *ἀμάω* is very similar. I cite a few examples. Aesch. Agam. 1028–9:

οἱ δ' οὔποτ' ἐλπίσαντες ἤμησαν καλῶς,

Aristoph. Knights 392 *τἀλλότριον ἀμῶν θέρος*, Plut. Apophthegm. Lacon. 21 *τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἀμώμεθα.*

From the passages quoted it appears that if *θερίζειν* had an object indicating in some way the gain that the Boeotian expects, or if we had *καλῶς* in place of *γέ τοι, θερίζειν* might be taken in the sense of 'make a profit' and cause no offence, even though the figure is somewhat poetical for the conversational tone of the context. But we find no reason for believing that the verb *θερίζειν* used without object or qualifying adverb could mean 'make a profit.' Even the absolute use of *καρποῦσθαι* in l. 837 of this play —*καρπώσεται γὰρ ἀνήρ*—can not fairly be urged to prove that *θερίζειν* has the same meaning, for the notion of gain was associated with the word *καρπός* from a very early period, so that *καρποῦσθαι* entered into business language with the meanings 'draw interest' and 'derive profit.' But it is no more likely that a Greek would say *μέλλω θερίζειν*, meaning 'I am going to make a profit,' than that we should use the simple words 'I am going to reap' with a similar connotation.

Following, perhaps, a suggestion conveyed in the third scholion, other commentators have adhered more closely to the ordinary meaning of *θερίζειν*, and have sought to justify its use here by pointing out resemblances between the action then going forward on the stage and the process of harvesting grain. Thus Mitchell, after mentioning the explanation of the scholiast, says: "Voss's explanation appears better: 'Having rolled up the sycophant in straw, he ties him as men tie a sheaf with the band.' Translate: *I must do some harvest-work first*, i. e. before all is well with me (*καλῶς ἔχει μοι*)." Paley translates: "Yes, I think I shall get a harvest out of him!", but adds: "Possibly he may mean 'they'll take me for a reaper,' i. e. carrying straw in a bundle."

These interpretations are not far from the truth, I think, and would have met with more favor if their authors had been able to

Digitized by Google

point to some definite and striking resemblance between the situation on the stage and the actions of reapers. To do this becomes easy enough if we may assume that the Boeotian had in mind an ancient harvest custom, which he might have seen practised on the grainfields of his native district, and which was observed in many parts of Europe until recent times. The custom existed in various forms, but one of the most common types may be thus described: The person who cut the last sheaf of the harvest, or some passing stranger, or even the owner of the harvest-field, was seized by the reapers, tied up in straw, especially the straw of the last sheaf, so as to be almost entirely enveloped, and was then carried off to the barn in a cart or on the shoulders of the reapers.

These harvest customs were first studied in a systematic manner by Mannhardt, especially in his Mythologische Forschungen, and again by Frazer in The Golden Bough. Their origin and significance are fully discussed by these writers, and need not concern us here. That similar customs were known to the Greeks is proved—to go no farther—by the story of Lityerses, for the sources and interpretation of which see Crusius in Roscher's Lexikon, s. v. *Lityerses*. It is treated by Mannhardt, M. F., pp. 1–57, and by Frazer, G. B. I, p. 365 ff.—It is by no means surprising to find an allusion to a primitive harvest custom in Aristophanes, who in more than one passage dwells with pleasure upon the peaceful and homely life of the farmer. In fact, Crusius (l. c., col. 2071) has already found in Birds 504 ff. an allusion to the rude raillery about the cuckoo at harvest and vintage, which is also mentioned by Horace, Sat. I 7, 28 ff. (see Mannhardt, p. 53).

Turning now to the play, we see that in l. 904 Dicaeopolis advises the Boeotian to take away with him a sycophant as a peculiarly Attic product. Nicarchus arrives opportunely and soon arouses the anger of Dicaeopolis, who in ll. 926–7 seizes him and calls for straw to tie him up with. From the encouraging words of the chorus in lines 929–32 we gather that Dicaeopolis proceeds to tie up the unfortunate Nicarchus, trussing him tightly like a piece of crockery wrapped with straw to prevent breaking. At the speech of Dicaeopolis in l. 944 ff.: *ἰσχυρόν ἐστιν ὦγάθ' κτλ.*, the sycophant has been made into a compact, straw-wrapped bundle, so that he can be carried upside down without damage. The work is complete, and the Boeotian and his servant are about

Digitized by Google

to lift their purchase to their shoulders and carry it away. Then the resemblance of the whole proceeding to the homely 'hairst-play' strikes our rustic; hence his remark μέλλω γέ τοι θερίζδειν, which we may render 'You see I'm going a-reaping,' or else adopt Paley's paraphrase, 'They'll take me for a reaper.'

It may be objected that a passing allusion to a rural custom would not be understood by an Athenian audience. But many country people would doubtless be among the spectators, and besides, down to the beginning of the Peloponnesian war many citizens of Athens owned farms and spent much of their time on them; so we can hardly doubt that the allusion would be appreciated by a part of the audience sufficiently large to make it worth while.

It is doubtful whether the explanation of θερίζειν here offered can throw any light upon the four lines following, in which corruption is suspected with much reason. Meineke's σὺ θέριζε for συνθέριζε of the manuscripts is perhaps the safest change that has been proposed.

CAMPBELL BONNER.

Digitized by Google

VII.—THE *æ/a/ɒ* OF 'ARE,' 'FATHER,' 'RATHER.'

The intermediate vowel *a* differs from other vowels in that it may change in either direction; that is, become a front *æ* or a back *ɒ* (cf. The School Review, June, 1895, p. 375). In English this tendency of *a* to change has been particularly pronounced. Thus Germanic *a* generally became *æ* in Old English, and Old-English *ā* became *ɒ̄* in Middle English. When, later, new *a*'s and *ā*'s arose, these too changed to *æ* and *ǣ*. In this way it came about that early Modern English did not have the vowel *a-ā* at all. But *a* and *ā* have again arisen under various conditions. The most general of these is the *a*, later *ā*, before final *r* ('far,' 'car') and before *r*+cons. ('cart,' 'shark,' etc.). Nearly as general is the *ā* before (silent) *l*+*m* ('calm,' 'palm,' etc.). Much less common is the *ā* before a voiceless fricative that is final ('pass,' 'path,' etc.) or followed by another consonant ('last,' 'laughter,' etc.); and still less frequent is the development of *ā* out of *ǣ*<*æ* before a nasal+fricative ('chance,' 'answer,' etc.) or a nasal+stop ('aunt,' 'grand,' etc.).

There are, however, a few cases of *æ*>*a* that can not be explained in any of these ways and for the most part[1] have not been explained at all. They are the almost universal 'are' and 'father' and the frequent 'rather' with *ā* for *ǣ* or *æ*. In 'are' we should expect *ǣ* and in 'father' and 'rather' *æ*; for 'are' belongs with 'bare,' 'fare,' etc., with originally medial *r*, and 'father' and 'rather' belong with 'gather' and 'lather,' in which the fricative is voiced and medial. *A priori* the *a*-vowel in these words might be due either to the same cause or to different causes. It will be observed, however, that the words have an important element in common; that is, their use in unstressed positions.

The verb 'are' is much more often quite unstressed ('The girls are gone; they are dead') than stressed ('Are they?' 'Yes, they are'). In fact, the word is rarely stressed unless it stands next to a weak personal pronoun, and even then the stress is often but slight ('Are they gone?').

[1] Sweet (History of English Sounds, §783) recognizes the modern pronunciation of *are* as originating in weak positions.

Digitized by Google

The word 'rather' is also less often stressed than unstressed. It is usually stressed when the verb is omitted ('Yes, I'd a little rather'; 'I'd rather than not'). Before weak 'do' it generally has secondary stress ('I'd rather do this than that'). Before a stressed verb ('I'd rather die than do it') and before a stressed adjective or adverb ('It's rather large and it would take rather long to do it. I'd rather not'), 'rather' is regularly weak; and it is these that are the usual uses of the word.

In ordinary narrative, 'father,' like 'lather' or any other common noun, is strong ('It's Father,' so especially in the call 'Father!') or has secondary stress ('His father had died'). But by all odds the most frequent use of the word is as a weak vocative before a sentence, especially a request ('Father, may I go down town?'; 'Father, John's got my knife!'). To those who have substituted 'Papa' for 'Father' as a term of address, this weak use of 'father' does not seem natural. They employ the word only in narrative, where it is fully stressed, and when they find it as a term of address in a book or elsewhere, they read it with full stress. Such persons may, however, be familiar with the corresponding weakening or obscuring of 'Pápa' and 'Máma,' in which the *ā* becomes *a* or *v* ('Puppa, may I go down town?'; 'Mumma, can't I have it?').

Now, in all these words ('are,' 'rather,' 'father') the strong or stressed form had *æ* and the weak form *a*. I am familiar with all the strong forms with *æ*: in the case of 'rather' this is my own usage and that of the vast majority of Americans; 'father' and 'are' with the old *æ* are now rare—both are rustic, and 'father' is heard most often from the lips of natives of New England country districts. The lengthening of the *a* to *ā* is due to the use of the weak form as a strong form. As this is a matter that I shall deal with systematically on another occasion, I may now refer to it but briefly.

Weak forms, being due to lack of stress and time, favor short and obscure vowels. So long as weak forms are used only where they arise—that is, in weak positions—we are generally unaware of their existence. If one calls a person's attention to his employment of them, he will generally deny it, and add: "It may have sounded so, because I said it rather quickly." When, however, the weak form intrudes on the ground of the strong form—that is, is used in stressed positions—then the short or obscure vowel, under the new condition of stress, undergoes a

Digitized by Google

change: if obscure, it becomes definite; if short, it may become long. When weak *ṇ ḷ* or *ən əl*, etc., became stressed in Germanic, the distinct vowel *u* was developed. In Modern English the words 'can' and 'had' have the strong forms *kæn* and *hæd* and the weak forms *kṇ* and *(h)əd*. Now, in the speech of the vulgar and in parts of the Midland (Pennsylvania and the country west of it) in the speech of all classes, the weak forms have driven out the strong ones, but they do not appear as *kṇ* and *(h)əd*, but as *ken* or *kin* and *(h)ed*. Thus also

	Old strong.	Weak.	New strong.
and:	*ænd*	*ṇd*	> hesitating *endə*
were:	*wḛ̄r*	*wər*	> *wə̄r*
you:	*yaų* (<*yū*)	*yu*	> *yū*
(m)any:	*(m)æni*	*(m)əni*	> *(m)eni*
saint:	*sēnt*	*sṇ(dʒon')*	> *sin'(dʒṇ)*

The old strong form *(m)æni* is still used in Ireland and parts of Canada, and *mæni* is the normal form in 'manifold,' in which it is always stressed. The weak form *sṇdʒon'* is the normal form with us, the form *sin'dʒṇ*, with shifted stress, prevailing in England. See also *ɪ̄ðṛ/aɪ̄ðṛ* in the next article.

Now for the application of this rule to the cases in hand. By the side of the old strong *ær* there was the weak form *ar*, which when used as a strong form became *ār*, as short-stressed *a* did not otherwise exist in the language. The same is true of *fāðṛ* and *rāðṛ* for *faðṛ raðṛ*.

By the side of *ar faðṛ raðṛ* there also existed as weak forms the still more obscure *ər fəðṛ rəðṛ*. These, too, to some extent intruded on the ground of the strong forms, 'are' appearing as *ə̄r*, with the vowel in 'her' ('They're dead, ə̄r they?'), and 'father' and 'rather' as *fvðṛ rvðṛ*, with the vowel in 'but.' The last of the three, which often occurs after the *'d* of 'had' or 'would' ('I'd ruther not'), sometimes attracts the *d* and appears as 'druther.' This is most strikingly manifest when the word is separated from the '(ha)d' or '(woul)d' ('Wouldn't you druther take this?').

We smile at those who say *ēr* and *fæðṛ*, on the supposition that they are betraying some provincial flattening of normal speech, while they are really retaining the normal form, and we, in saying *ār* and *fāðṛ*, are doing just the same kind of thing as are those who say *ə̄r*, *rvðṛ*, etc., which we regard as very vulgar.

Digitized by Google

THE *ɪ/aɛ̯* OF '(N)EITHER' AND 'KEY.'

Old-English *ǣg̊* underwent the following changes: ME. *ɛ̯i̯*, MnE. [*ɛ̄*, *ē*] *ɛ̯ɛ̯*: 'clay,' 'gray,' 'neigh,' 'whey,' etc. In 'key' and '(n)either,' however, it has the sound *ɪ*, and in the latter often the sound *aɛ̯*.

The only serious treatment of the subject that I know of is that of Luick (Untersuchungen zur englischen Lautgeschichte, p. 183, etc.), and he does not seem thoroughly satisfied with his results. He regards 'key' *kɪ̄* as a Northwestern-Midland "dialektische Entwicklung, die im 17. Jahrhundert in die Schriftsprache drang." Similarly, he finds the source of the pronunciation of 'either' and 'neither' with the sound heard in 'eye,' etc., "in gewissen nord-englischen, namentlich aber schottischen Dialekten." I can not reconcile myself to the idea of deriving from distant dialects the pronunciation of ordinary words. If a pronunciation is of dialectic origin, we should expect some special reason for its conquest over that of the standard language. So, when we observe *vat* and *keg* for *fat* and *kag*, we find the explanation in the fact that the brewing business in London was largely in the hands of people from the adjacent South-Thames territory. But it would be very difficult to show why the Northwestern or Northern pronunciation of such words as 'key' and 'either' should have prevailed at London. As to the pronunciation of *(n)either* with *ɪ* (as in 'me'), Luick says: "Ich möchte eher [than, with Morsbach, assume an OE. **ǣðer*] an eine Folge von Satzunbetontheit denken." This suggestion is a good one, but we shall see directly that it applies not to this but to the other pronunciation of 'either' and 'neither.'

It will be observed that in most of the words involved ('gray,' 'neigh,' 'whey,' etc.) the diphthong is final, the best possible position for the maintenance of such a diphthong. Moreover, 'gray' is an adjective, 'neigh' is a verb, and 'clay' and 'whey' are rarely, if ever, inflected. In '(n)either' the diphthong is followed by *ðr̥*, a common cause of shortening, while 'key' very frequently occurs in the plural and is the first member of various compounds; for example, 'keyhole,' 'keyring,' 'keystone,' etc. Under these conditions we should expect the over-long diphthong *ɛ̯i̯* to suffer either (1) the loss of the nonsyllabic element *i̯* or (2) the shortening of the *ɛ̯* to *ɛ̯*, earlier than it did so when *not* before a consonant. The former happened when the words were used

Digitized by Google

as strong, or stressed, forms, which 'keys,' 'keyhole,' etc., always were. Thus, *(n)ę̄i̯ðr̥* became *(n)ę̄ðr̥* and *kę̄i̯s*, etc., became *kę̄s* (later *kę̄z*, by analogy to other plurals in which the weak *e*, being after a consonant, remained longer and thus caused the change of weak *s* to *z*), and then went through all the normal changes *ę̄>ē>ī*, whence the usual MnE. *(n)īðr̥* and *kī*. As the *ę̄i̯* of 'either' always stood before *ðr̥*, while the *ę̄i̯* of 'key' was followed by a consonant only in the plural and in compounds, we find the evidence of the loss of the *i̯* in the former (that is, ME. *ę̄per*) earlier than in the latter. In the case of 'key' there was evidently a long struggle between the simple form riming with 'gray' and the inflected and compound forms riming with 'sea,' which ultimately resulted in the victory of the latter.

But '(n)either' often occurred in weak positions (for example, 'Neither *you* nor *I*,' 'Either *this* or *that*'), and thus it too got a byform. The *ę̄* shortened to *ę*; that is, *nę̄i̯ðr̥* became *nęi̯ðr̥*, the present (Irish etc.) dialectic form. This weak form in time regularly suffered obscuration to *nəi̯ðr̥* (reported already in the 16th century), which when stressed (for example, 'Which?' 'Neither') became *nai̯ðr̥*, and later the present *naęðr̥*. 'Neither' with the diphthong heard in 'eye' is, then, only a strong form that has arisen out of a weak one, like those in the article above. The older strong form *īðr̥* is rapidly retreating before *aęðr̥* in England. In America, though *aęðr̥* early appeared in the East, being natural to Franklin from his childhood, it has made little progress except in the larger seaport towns. It is taught in many fashionable schools for girls, especially in the East, and one can find two or three persons in almost any community who have substituted it for their natural *īðr̥*, generally from a notion that it is more *élite*. Episcopalian clergymen on returning from a visit to England are wont to assume it along with other usages that suggest the Church of England.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, ANN ARBOR,
October, 1900.

GEORGE HEMPL.

Digitized by Google

NOTES.

On Greek and Latin Negatives.

1. *Latin haud* : *Greek οὐ*.

The explanations of Latin *haud* and Greek *οὐ* offered by Horton-Smith in volume XVIII of this Journal and the same scholar's explanation of *ἄνευ* mentioned in the same article, and more fully developed in B. B. 22, 189 ff., are, it seems to me, open to some objections.

Whatever may be the true etymological explanation of Lat. *haud* and Gr. *οὐ*, it is certain that their negative meaning is an acquired one, and it is probable that the development of each took place separately. Hence the fact that the same meaning attaches to the words has no great bearing upon the question of their etymological connection.

All four forms—*au hau haud haut*—existed, but I confess an inability to see that Horton-Smith has made a case for *au* as the original Latin form. The fact that the earliest occurrence happens to be *hau* proves nothing. There is evidence for both *haut* and *haud* in the inscriptions and for all three forms in the manuscripts of the earliest authors. Statements of the Grammarians, having in mind, as they did, the Gr. *οὐ*, are to be looked on with suspicion.

It is very difficult to see how *sed* could cause the addition of *-d* to *hau* by analogy. Negatives may exert an influence upon one another, as may adversative conjunctions, and so on; but how a negative could be influenced by an adversative conjunction it is impossible to conceive. The case is no better for the supposed influence of the ablatival *-d*. In neither case is there a point of contact that would permit the working of analogy. The opposing view must be supported by a number of certain examples.

Doubt is cast on Horton-Smith's theory that Lat. *(h)au(d)* is from I.E. *ou̯* by the somewhat dubious character of Thurneysen's law when applied to the *o* of the *e* : *o* ablaut series. (Cf. Brugmann, Grundriss, I², §163, Anm. See, however, Hirt, Ablaut, §35, Anm.)

Digitized by Google

In view of the large number of cases of non-etymological *h*-, there can be no objection to assuming with Horton-Smith that the initial of *haud* is 'vorgeschoben,' and so I also have explained it in my treatment of the word (Negatives of the Indo-European Languages). In that discussion I started with the form *au-t(i)* (identical with the conjunction *aut*), which has various congeners: Skr. *ō*, Gr. *αὖ*, Lat. *au-tem*, Osc. av-ti, Umbr. u-te, Goth. *auh*, O.H.G. *ouh*. The original meaning as indicated by these words was 'further, again,' or a still more general intensive force. The Lat. *autem* is itself occasionally employed as an intensive in Plautus; e. g. Pseud. 305, Amph. 901. Those negatives concerning whose semantic history there is certainty have acquired their meaning through use as intensives to other negatives (cf. now Bréal, Essai sémantique, chapitre 21). It is probable that *(h)aut* received its meaning in this way. The particle *aut*, on the one hand, took on the conjunctional use and meaning; on the other was used as an intensive to a negative, and thence became a negative adverb. That the non-etymological *h*- became permanently attached to the negative was due partly at least to the need felt for a formal distinction between adverb and conjunction. It would not be strange, then, if we should find, occasionally, *haud* used, not as an independent negative, but just as *pas* commonly in French. Instances of this use we have, possibly, in the *neque haud* in Plautus and elsewhere. So-called double negatives are only possible when the negatives have different applications, which probably is not the case in the *neque haud* sentences. For example, see Plautus, Persa 535 Neque mihi haud imperito eveniet.

The interchange of *-t* and *-d*, whether it is due, in the first place, to assimilation to initials of following words or whether it is altogether an orthographical confusion, is explained as easily under the supposition of an original *-t* as of an original *-d*. The form *hau* arose through the dropping of the *-d* after the long-vowel sound.

The comparative infrequency of the form *haut* on the inscriptions speaks somewhat against my explanation; but the occurrence of the word in any form is rare on the inscriptions. On the other hand, the advantages of my explanation are: (1) that the explanation of a final consonant is a far more probable one, (2) that a connection is made with an I.E. particle capable of being used as an intensive, and not with a verbal root, and (3) the development of meaning supposed is one that can be illustrated

Digitized by Google

elsewhere; while for the development supposed by Horton-Smith we have no example; we know of no full-fledged negative adverb that has developed its negative meaning in that way.

In the case of Gr. οὐ the last two considerations should have weight; that is, we should, if possible, connect this negative with an I.E. particle and suppose a development similar to that which has taken place in the case of French *pas*.

Whatever else may be said of the -χι and -κι of the Greek negative (cf. now Brugmann, Gr. Gr., pp. 117, 244), certainly it is not necessary to suppose that when they were added to οὐ they had the force of 'this.' Much more probable is it that they had an indefinite intensive force.

It is quite generally held that the initial syllable of Gr. ἄνευ contains the negative (cf. Brugmann, Gr. Gr., §516); but that the final syllable ever had a negative or 'quasi-negative' force in the compound, as held by Horton-Smith (B. B. 22, 190), is impossible, for the reason mentioned above—that a double negative can not exist unless the negatives have separate applications. One negative applied to another does not strengthen it, but destroys it.

2. *Latin nihil nīl.*

Fay (A. J. P. 18, 462) explains *nihil nīl* as from a **ne-hi-elum*. To be sure, a Latin *hīlum* is not attested by many examples, but certainly those given by Forcellini can not be all fictions. In regard to the example in Ennius it must be remembered that the first syllable of the word in his time was *ni-* (An. 170 and *nil*, Fab. 197, Mueller). There would be something more than tmesis carried to the extreme in the writing of *neque* (or *nec*) *dispendi facit hilum* for *nihilumque dispendi facit*. Fay's cognates of **elum* I do not discuss, except to call attention to the fact that Czerep, in Archiv, XI 583, claims that *elementum* is a Semitic loan-word.

LOMBARD COLLEGE, GALESBURG, ILL. FRANK H. FOWLER.

ON THE SEPTUAGINT TEXT OF I SAMUEL 20. 3 AND EPISTLE OF JEREMIAH 26.

I Samuel 20. 3. For μὴ οὐ βούληται read μὴ λυπῆται. The proposed reading is an exact translation of the present Hebrew text, פֶּן־יֵעָצֵב 'lest he be grieved.' The same verb is rendered by

Digitized by Google

λυποῦμαι, Gen. 45. 5 and II Sam. 19. 2 (Heb. 19. 3). Moreover, the context favors the correction of the Greek from the Hebrew rather than of the Hebrew from the Greek. It is natural to suppose that Saul kept Jonathan in ignorance of his plan to kill David, not from the fear that he would 'refuse his consent,' but out of regard for Jonathan's feelings. 'Let not Jonathan know this, lest he be grieved.' The initial consonants of the first two syllables of λυπῆται could easily have been transposed in copying. Cf. Isaiah 48. 11, where the first hand of Codex Vaticanus wrote βεβούληται for βεβηλοῦται. The resulting μὴ βούληται was meaningless, and hence οὐ was added later.

Epistle of Jeremiah 26: αἰσχύνονταί τε καὶ οἱ θεραπεύοντες αὐτά, διὰ τό, μή ποτε ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν πέσῃ, δι' αὐτῶν ἀνίστασθαι· μήτε ἐάν τις αὐτο ὀρθὸν στήσῃ, δι' ἑαυτοῦ κινηθήσεται, μήτε ἐὰν κλιθῇ, οὐ μὴ ὀρθωθῇ, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ νεκροῖς τὰ δῶρα αὐτοῖς παρατίθεται. This is the text of Codex Vaticanus as given in Swete's manual edition of the Septuagint. For the first μήτε Codex Alexandrinus and first hand of Codex Marchalianus have μή ποτε. Cod. Alex. also has μή ποτε for the second μήτε. Textus receptus, διὰ τό, εἴ ποτε ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν πέσῃ, μὴ δι' αὐτῶν ἀνίστασθαι.

The use of μή ποτε in this passage seems to have given trouble to early scribes as well as to modern scholars. Fritzsche, for example, tries to get round the difficulty by rendering it *si quando*, and compares II Tim. 2. 25. Similarly Zöckler, *wenn einmal*. So Rothstein, in Kautzsch's Apokryphen (1900), translates, according to Codd. A and B, *wenn sie einmal hingefallen sind*, but gives in a footnote a translation of the passage from text. rec. So too English Revised Version. Such an interpretation, however, seems forced and unsatisfactory. The New Testament, to be sure, contains one or two cases of this usage (Luke 3. 15, II Tim. 2. 25), and in the Septuagint μή ποτε often = אוּלַי 'perhaps' (e. g. Gen. 24. 5, 39, I Kgs. 18. 27), but there is no case in the Septuagint—unless this be one—where μή ποτε = *si quando*.

The simplest emendation would be to insert ἐάν after διὰ τὸ μή, but the variant readings of Cod. Alex. suggest the following as on the whole more probable: αἰσχύνονται δὲ καὶ οἱ θεραπεύοντες αὐτά, διὰ τὸ μήτε, ἐάν ποτε ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν πέσῃ, δι' ἑαυτῶν ἀνίστασθαι· μήτε ἐάν τις αὐτὸ ὀρθὸν στήσῃ, δι' ἑαυτοῦ κινηθήσεται, κτλ. 'Moreover, even those that serve them are ashamed, for the reason that if they (the idols) fall to the ground, they can neither rise of themselves; nor,

Digitized by Google

if one set them upright, can they move of themselves; nor, if they be tipped out of place, can they right themselves, but gifts are set before them, as for the dead.'

By reading μήτε instead of μή ποτε in each case—the first as well as the second and third—the three clauses are brought into correlation. The mistake of the various scribes is the more easily accounted for, if ποτε originally followed the first ἐάν (ἐάν ποτε . . . πέσῃ). The change of construction from an infinitive in the first clause to a future indicative in the second, need occasion no surprise, since such changes are common in the Septuagint.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY. JOHN WESLEY RICE.

Digitized by Google

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Schmalz's Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik. Dritte Auflage. 1900.

During the last decade, which separates the second edition from the third, considerable attention has been given to the genetic study of the various problems of Latin syntax, particularly at the two extremes of their development—their incipiency on the one hand, their treatment by the later writers, especially in the field of Christian Latin, on the other.

In the second edition one may find a comprehensive and succinct account of our knowledge in the domain of Latin syntax and style up to 1890. The third edition is carried forward on the same lines, digesting and summarizing the results reached by various scholars during the last ten years, with the addition of valuable contributions from the ripe scholarship of the author. The latest theories regarding several important departments in these two fields have been incorporated, e. g. the gerund, gerundive, supines, infinitive with adjectives and the historical infinitive.

The third edition is in quality just what one would expect from so thorough and painstaking a scholar as Schmalz. On every side appear evidences of a careful revision: errors have been corrected, many sections have been entirely rewritten and enlarged, while others have received a different order of treatment. But the third edition not only marks an advance in quality, but in quantity as well, and that to an extent of about 100 pages, 16 of which belong to the Stilistik, the remainder to the Syntax. The numbering of the sections in the Stilistik remains the same, those of the Syntax have increased from 309 to 351. The general 'Litteratur,' as one would expect, has been enlarged, from 105 sections to 158, and recent special monographs have been added under the appropriate sections. All in all, the result has been that a valuable work is made more valuable, and a work produced which no Latin scholar who wishes the latest and most authoritative views in these two fields can afford to be without.

The object of the present paper is to call attention to the appearance of this new edition, its many valuable features, and to point out a few errors still remaining. As supplementary to the passages given, some peculiarities of expression hitherto not cited are added by way of further illustration, the aim being to give a more complete[1] history of some of the various usages of Latin Syntax and Style.

[1] Completeness, it should be remarked, is disclaimed by Schmalz; cf. p. 202: "Allein Vollständigkeit ist bei Plan und Zweck meiner Arbeit überhaupt nicht in Aussicht genommen."

Digitized by Google

P. 209, Einleitung. In §108, John Hopkins for Johns Hopkins, and in §109, stilistic for stylistic.

§13. *Tu* in expressions of command occurs frequently in Juv. (cf. Weidner ad 14. 48).

§15, Anm. 1. Cf. also Mart. 4. 18. 1 qua vicina *pluit* Vipsanis columnis.

§32. Adverb used attributively; cf. also Mart. 3. 58. 51 and 10. 58. 2.

§48, Anm. 4. The ablative of duration of time occurs in Plaut. Bacch. 6 qui annis viginti errans a patria afuit; cf. also Ter. Ad. 520, 527. Such expressions are very rare until the period of Silver Latin, where they occur with sufficient frequency to deserve a note. Cf. Vell. Pat. 1. 1. 3; Plin. Mai., especially with *vivit*, as 10. 44 vivit annis XXV, etc. Plin. Min. uses it 13 times; Sen. Ep. 18. 1. 28 viginti et septem annis pugnatum est; cf. also 5. 64 and 67, and 15. 1. 3. Mort. Claud. 6. 1. Martial was fond of this construction; cf. 2. 5. 1; 3. 63. 7; 4. 37. 6; 5. 29. 7; 7. 20. 3; 65. 3; 9. 67. 1; 11. 77. 2; 12. 57. 6; 65. 1.

§55. Further examples, for *en* Juvenal, 2. 72; 6. 531; en Christum, Prud. Apoth. 503; en documentum, Ham. 769; en nummos, Peristeph. 2. 293; cf. also Sym. Epist. 1. 80 en tibi litteras; and 2. 19; 6. 56.

§58, Anm. 1. Lorenz's note in the 2d ed. of the Mil. Glor. is to 1434, not 1422.

§62. Add Quint. 2. 1. 6 eo usque scientiae progredi posse; 9. 2. 90 agit cum eo dementiae.

§64. Sil. Ital. 14. 343 uses *nudus opum*; Plin. Min. 9. 13. 11 has *incertus* with the gen.

§67. *Obliviscor* with acc. of things: cf. Petron., §§66, 76, 125; but the gen. in 26, 71, 79, 94, 96, 132, 136.

§74, Anm. *Nomen est* etc. *Gen.* in Val. Max. 1. 8. ext. 8 cui nomen erat equi; *dat.* in Lact. 1. 6. 31; 11. 6; 5. 4. 3; *nom.* in Suet. Vesp. 2 cui nomen est Phalacrine; Gell. 1. 2. 2; 4. 3. 2; 11. 14; 5. 14. 11; 13. 2. 5 (*dat.* in 9. 13. 2; 17. 21. 33); Macrob. 1. 11. 42.

§84, Anm. *Gratia* was used by Quint. 69 times (41 with a noun, 12 with a gerund, 16 with a gerundive) to *causa* 10 times. Tac. with ger. construction uses *causa* 5 times to *gratia* twice, and Caesar has *causa* 85 times to *gratia* twice (cf. Am. Journ. Philol. XIX (1898), p. 278). (In Quint. the gerund is never used with an object.)

§88. Quint. X 1. 94 *multum* tersior, even though the reading is disputed. It is read by Halm, Krueger[3], Meister, Hild and Peterson (cf. further Becher, Jahresb. 1887, p. 46), and is found in Stat. Theb. 9. 559; Juv. 10. 197 and 12. 66 (cf. πολὺ μεῖζον).

§89, Anm. 4. Cf. also Sen. Phaedr. 870 properato est opus.

§91. *Egeo*: Sen. phil. (prose) has abl. 9 times (Dial. 1. 5. 10; 6. 5; 2. 13. 2; Ben. 3. 35. 5; Epist. 1. 9. 14; 12. 5; 6. 6. 28; 9. 3. 12; 11. 1. 3); gen. 0 times; Quint. abl. 23 times, but gen. 3 (2. 16. 13; 8. 63; 5. 14. 5). Plin. Min. abl. 5 times (1. 8. 10; 3.

Digitized by Google

7. 15; 4. 3. 5; 6. 29. 2; 9. 13. 5); gen. 0 times; Juv. abl. 3 times (7. 62; 13. 97; 7. 228); gen. 2 times (14. 288; 15. 147). The statement is made that Prud. uses *plenus* only with the abl., but cf. Peristeph. 4. 5 plena angelorum, and Psych. 769 plenum virtutis.

The following table will show the usage in some of the more important writers of the Silver Age:

Val. Max. uses the gen.	15	times to the abl.	2	times.		
Sen. phil. (prose)	"	5	"	"	11	"
Plin. Mai.	"	18	"	"	3	"
Quint.	"	6	"	"	6	"
Tacitus	"	6	"	"	5	"
Plin. Min.	"	0	"	"	4	"
Sen. phil. (poetry)	"	0	"	"	2	"
Lucan	"	3	"	"	17	"
Petronius	"	1	"	"	12	"
Val. Flacc.	"	3	"	"	8	"
Sil. Ital.	"	3	"	"	3	"
Statius	"	0	"	"	12	"
Martial	"	1	"	"	3	"
Juvenal	"	0	"	"	13	"

Prose usage: gen. = 51, abl. = 53. *Poetical*: gen. = 10, abl. = 57.

The greatest divergence from the class. usage is, therefore, in poetry, Stat. and Juv. using the abl. alone, and in the *sermo familiaris*, Plin. Min. using the abl. alone, while Petron. uses the abl. 12 times to the gen. once. Val. Max. and Plin. Mai. follow, in the main, the class. usage. The note of Quint. 9, 3, 1, to the effect that the abl. is the common usage of his time, is interesting in this connection. In the writers considered the gen. was used 61 times to the abl. 110 times. In Quint. himself and Tac., however, the gen. occurs as frequently as the abl.

For the abl. in Val. Max. cf. 5. 6. ext. 5, and 7. 5. 4; Plin. Mai. has the abl. 5. 9; 9. 80; 20. 14; Plin. Min. has abl. 1. 10. 2; 2. 1. 7; 7. 9. 6; Pan. 23. Val. Flacc. has gen. 1. 230; 235; 2. 441; but the abl. 1. 233; 396; 646; 2. 111; 267; 507; 5. 182, and 7. 456. Seneca the abl. Oed. 158; Troad. 1098. Mart., gen. 4. 40. 7; abl. 4. 33. 1; 6. 27. 6; 12. 32. 21. Gerber and Greef, Lex. Tac., omit Ann. 4. 3. 1 plena Caesarum domus.

§99. *Here* occurs in Plin. Min. 2. 7. 1 and 14. 6 (the only two passages), in Keil's edition (F pra read *heri* in each passage).[1]

[1] Riccard. in the index gives *here* in II 7. 1, the letter being lost from the text; in II 14. 6 the text reads *heri*. Through the kindness of Professor E. T. Merrill I am able to add the following critical note: Eucharius Silber (Rome, 1490) reads *here* in both places; Verecellius (Tarvisium, 1483) reads *heri* in both places. "Pomponius Laetus in notes in his own handwriting in a copy of the edition of 1483 in my possession emends *heri* to *here* in both places." From his collation of two MSS (saec. XV): Urbin. lat. 1153 reads *heri* in II 7. 1, and (by easy error) in II 14. 6 *Neri*; Ottobon. lat. 1965 reads *heri* in both places.

Digitized by Google

§101. Cf. *ad hunc modum*, Quint. 10. 5. 2.

§103. Tibullus (Hiller's Index) uses *ante* 25 times as a prep. to 9 times as an adverb.

§107. Schmalz says of *propius* as a prep., "nicht bei Cic."; but cf. Phil. VII 26 *propius urbem.*

§132. *Procul dubio* occurs in Val. Max. 3. 2. 9; 6. 2. 5; 9 ext. 1; Plin. Mai. 2. 165; 9. 184; 18. 187; Quint. 1. 5. 14; 9. 2. 27 (Quint. 12. 11. 7 uses *procul* contentionibus, and Ov. Trist. 4. 2. 69 has *procul* Latio); Gell. 2. 29. 15; 13. 13. 3; 16. 2. 2.

§147. *Necesse habeo* with infin. Quint. uses this formula 5 times: 3. 8. 24; 7. 2. 16; 53; 8. 5. 3; 11. 1. 74. Cf. also Pseudo-Quint. Decl. 25. 3; 57. 27; 136. 2; 148. 7; 152. 12; 16; 173. 20; 299. 26; 326. 5; 334. 20. Petron., §§3, 54. Aug. Civ. Dei 4. 30; Ambrose De Off. 3. 12, §78 (bis). Gell. 14. 1. 2 has *habeo dicere.*

§149 *a.* Cf. also Juv. 3. 3 sedem figere Cumis *destinet*, a construction belonging to Archaic and Silver Latinity. Cf. also 10. 330 and Plin. Min. 3. 5. 20.

§150. *Durum est* with infin. Cf. Hor. Sat. 1. 9. 42 and Juv. 6. 98.

§158. 4. *Necessum est* with infin. occurs at least 7 times in Gell.; cf. 7 (6). 1. 3; 7 (6). 14. 4; 10. 11. 7; 15. 8; 13. 20 (19). 11; 16. 2. 8; 19. 5. 6.

§162. 5. In "litteratur" change Harward to Harvard.

§170. 1. Abl. of gerundive is used as a subst. by Juv. 14. 38 abstineas igitur damnandis.

§182. Suet. Dom. 14 has *quamquam* omnium talium appetentissimus; Plin. Min. uses *quamquam* with adj. or part. 21 times (cf. Kraut, Synt. u. Stil d. jüng. Plin., p. 35). *Quamvis* with part., cf. also Mart. 5. 15. 5; 65. 1; 6. 58. 5; 11. 69. 1; 104. 15; Ambrose De Off. 1. 36, §183; 2. 12, §61; Lact. 4. 1. 7. *Licet* with a part., cf. Apul. Met. 5. 1 licet sole nolente; Ambrose De Off. 3. 14, §87; §106; §115; cf. Tert. Pudic. 2, licet patiens; Anim. 58 licet non expectata. In Aug. Civ. Dei I noted 25 such occurrences.

§183. Double forms like *amatus fui* for *amatus sum* etc. Schmalz says: "nicht bei Plin. Min. und nicht bei Tac." But cf. Plin. Min. 10. 4. 2 professa fuerat; 74. 2 ornatus fuisset; Pan. 23 dimissus fueras (so Trajan. 28 reversus fuerit, and 34. 1 contracti fuerint). For Tac. cf. Hist. 1. 16. 16 territus fueris (the speech of Galba). Cf. Petron., §53 empti fuerint. Quint. also uses such forms. Bonnell, Lex. Quint. Proleg., p. xxviii, cites 8 examples with *ero* and 4 with *fuero.* To his list add, for *fuero*: 2. 8. 4; 3. 6. 1; 19; 4. 1. 59; 76; 2. 8; 36; 5. 10. 122; 12. 3; 13. 25; 6 proem. 15; 10. 1. 19; 11. 1. 2 (i. e. 17 in all instead of 4). Quint. also uses: iunctae fuerunt, 1. 10. 17; deprehensus fuerat. 5. 10. 36; fuerat actum, 9. 2. 74; and fuisset inventum, 10. 2. 5; cf. also Gell. 10. 1. 1 scriptum fuit; 20. 6. 15 dicta fuerant.

§196. *Utrumne . . . an* in a direct question. Cf. Sen. Oed. 313; 1058; Agam. 600; Thyest. 1037 (cf. §273).

Digitized by Google

§259. *Igitur*, the first word in a sentence. Cf. also Val. Max., who shows 13 examples: 1. 8. 10; 2. 7. 5; 4. 1. ext. 8; 6. ext. 3; 4. 7. ext. 1; 5. 4. 6; 11. 2. ext. 1; 7. 4. 3; 5. 2; 9. 3. 8; 8. ext. 1; 12. 7; 14 praef. Petron. twice, §§25, 114 (to 17 postpositive). Quint. 16 times (Neue, III², p. 975, cites only 12; cf. Class. Rev. XIII (1898), p. 130) (139 times postpositive); Plin. Mai. 9 times: 2. 64; 106; 112; 3. 47; 18. 22; 163; 282; 36. 20; 37. 158; Plin. Min. 17 times. In Gellius I have noted but one example, 6 (7). 5. 7. Suet. uses *igitur* thus very rarely, cf. Aug. 32; Galba 10, and Lact. more frequently: 1. 11. 22; 16. 6; 2. 5. 30; 3. 12. 28; 5. 19. 26.

§260. *Itaque* postpositive. Cf. also Sen. Contr. pr. 22; 2. 1. 19; 5. 2; 3 pr. 1; 7. 4. 6; 7. 14; 9 pr. 1; 3. 10 (8 times). Val. Max. 8 times: 2. 6. 8; 12; 7. 11; 3. 1. 2; 2. 1; 7. 1. 7; 2 ext. 1; 8. 10. 1. Vell. Paterc. 5 times: 2. 37. 3; 53. 2; 60. 2; 111. 1; 118. 4. Petron. 7 times (69 = first word); Plin. Mai. 2. 129; 8. 17. 6; 10. 186; 12. 100, and Plin. Min. ad Trai. 6. 2; 23. 1 (Trajan also: 34. 2; 38. 1). For Seneca, Neue cites only De Ira 2. 31. 2. His usage (in prose) is as follows: first, 246 times; second, 184 times; third, 132 times. He follows a different practice in his epistles from that of his philos. works: in philos. works, *itaque* is placed first 128 times to postpositive 147 times, but in his epistles he reverses the ratio: *itaque* is placed first 118 times, but postpositive only 69 times. In this regard Seneca is more classical in his epistles than in his philosophical works. Suet. places *itaque* second 2 times: Aug. 10 and Tib. 11. Pseudo-Quint. Decl. (Ritter) shows *igitur* first 10 times and *itaque* second 6 times. Ambrose in De Off. shows 14 examples of *itaque* in the second place, and Lact. 32.

§262. *Nec non et.* Plin. Mai. and Quint. are placed side by side by Schmalz without comment, although Quint. has only one example (9. 4. 25) and Plin. Mai. 17 (7. 78; 183; 12. 34; 17; 13. 72; 14. 121; 266; 18. 365; 19. 63; 20. 87; 26. 147; 28. 251; 29. 3; 31. 80; 32. 110; 33. 23; 36. 165). Kübler, Archiv f. lat. Lex. VII 141, as well as Schmalz, omits Lucan 3. 516; 7. 56; 10. 486. Ilias Lat. 238; Sil. Ital. 2. 432; 7. 86; 9. 66; 11. 111; 225; 277; Statius, Achil. 1. 1. 923; Theb. 2. 371; 6. 420; Flor. 1. 19. 2. Carm. Epigr. (B.) 712. 21; 733. 4; 900. 13. Macrob. 7. 2. 6; Claud. Rapt. Pros. 1. 264; 3. 14. Optatus 20. 10.

§263. *At enim*, common in Lact. (cf. Bünemann, Index).

§264. Quinct. 12. 4. 1 has *non modo* ... *verum* ... *ne* ... quidem.

§266. Cf. also *fac velis*, Caec. Stat. (Ribb., p. 81) and Prud. Cath. 6. 132 *fac signet*, and Claud. Maur. 205. 19 *fac memineris*. *Cave faxis* occurs in Naev., p. 13; Caecil. Stat., p. 55, and Syrus, p. 111 and p. 120. Cf. also Hor. S. 2. 338; Petron., §58, and Prud. Per. 10. 136.

§269. For *neu* ... *neu* cf. also Tib. 1. 2. 35; 6. 17–19; 2. 1. 19–20.

Digitized by Google

§273 (p. 362). Indirect questions. *Utrumne* alone occurs at least 13 times in Lact. (2. 7. 8; 11; 11. 11; 3. 7. 5, etc.); *utrumne —an*, 8 times (2. 12. 4; 3. 8. 33; 23. 5; 6. 20. 16; 21. 2; 7. 13. 5; Epit. 2. 1; 24. 2; *utrumne—an—an—an—utrum . . . an* in 3. 3. 4. Cf. §196.

§282. *Ut qui*, common in Plin. Min. (cf. 4. 11. 6; 5. 8. 4; 16. 8; 6. 13. 2; 8. 18. 3; 9. 3. 3; 37. 2; Pan. 55, all with the subj.

§288. *Adde quod* was used 8 times by Quint. (1. 2. 21; 3. 16; 10. 1. 33; 2. 10; 11; 12; 12. 1. 14; 11. 29); Seneca (phil.), however, uses *adice quod* oftener than *adde quod*, and frequently *adice nunc quod*; for *adde quod* cf. also Plin. Min. 8. 14. 22; Juv. 14. 114; 15. 47.

§292. *Praeter id quod*, cf. also Quint. 3. 8. 40; 5. 10. 45; 10. 1. 28; 2. 26; 36. *Praeter quam quod* is also used by Sen. (phil.) and Plin. Min. *Nisi quod*, cf. Tac. Ann. 3. 1. 18; 68. 8; Germ. 9. 5; 29. 12; Dial. 41. 5.

§293. Plin. Min. was fond of *quia*, using it 76 times. Gell. 7 (6). 2. 11 uses *non quia* with the indic. Ps.-Quint. Decl., p. 229. 28 has *non quia* necesse est . . . *nec quia* solvit.

§302. *Quamquam* with the subj., cf. also Sen. De Ira 3. 19. 1; Dial. 7. 26. 7. More frequently in poetry: Lucan. 2. 350; 473; Sil. Ital. 16. 49; Val. Flacc. 8. 205; Stat. Silv. 2. 1. 144; 5. 1. 53; 2. 48; Achil. 1. 467. Plin. Min. has the subj. 10 times (Kraut, Synt. u. Stil Plin., p. 35); cf. also Gell. 7 (6). 2. 7; 13. 25 (24). 11; 15. 22. 10, and 17. 2. 22.

§304. *Quamvis* with imperf. or pluperf., rare in the class. period, becomes more common in the Silver Age and is frequent in late Latin.

a. *Imperf. subj.*: Prop. 1. 3. 13; 2. 9. 7; Hor. C. 4. 6. 7; Phaedr. 3. 2. 5; Lucan. 4. 609; Stat. V praef., Juv. 6. 93; Val. Max. 2. 2. 1; Sen. Benef. 3. 34. 1; Epist. 11. 2. 4; 14. 1. 8; Plin. Mai. 17. 37; Plin. Min. 4. 5. 2; 5. 5. 3; 10. 10; ad Trai. 47. 2; 58. 4; 79. 5; Pan. 74; Tac. Ann. 2. 38. 27; 15. 53. 17; Hist. 4. 11. 5; Dial. 2. 11; Suet. Aug. 41; 52; 84; 101; Florus 1. 23. 2; 41. 4; Ps.-Quint. Decl. 119. 7; and in Christian Latin: Aug. Civ. Dei 5. 12; 7. 33; 9. 21; 10. 31; 13. 20; 14. 12; 22. 8; Ambrose De Off. 1. 18, §69; Lact. 7. 8. 2; 8; 9. 2; Mort. 26. 6.

b. *Pluperf. subj.*: Sen. Contr. 7. 6; Sen. Med. 655; Clem. 1. 10. 2; Lucan. 6. 59; Petron., §138; Plin. Mai. 33. 10; Plin. Min. 5. 13. 5; ad Trai. 10. 1; Suet. Aug. 91; 101; and in Christian Latin: Cypr. 893; Lact. Epit. 22. 5; Aug. Civ. Dei 5. 18.

c. *Quamvis* with indic., cf. also Val. Max. 2. 2. 7; Sen. Benef. 3. 32. 5; Lucan. 3. 748; 4. 247; Petron., §58; Stat. Silv. 3. 2. 52; Theb. 4. 743; 7. 250 (for *licet* with indic. cf. Archiv, XI (1898), p. 25).

§304, Anm. 2. Mart. uses *licet* 54 times to *quamvis* 15 times (cf. Class. Rev. XII (1898), p. 30). Plin. Min. uses *licet* (concessive) 19 times (Kraut, p. 36, cites only 5. Add to his list: 1. 12. 12; 2. 13. 10; 16. 3; 5. 14. 2; 6. 7. 3; 34. 3; 7. 19. 8; 28. 16;

Digitized by Google

30. 4; 9. 8. 1; ad Trai. 108. 2; Pan. 11; 34; 88), and Quint. 28 times. For *licet* with a secondary tense Schmalz cites b. Hisp. and Juv. as introducing this usage; but while Juv. shows but one example (13. 56), Mart. shows two (5. 39. 8; 9. 91. 3). Cf. also Macrob. 1. 7. 4 licet fecisset. Lact. uses it with *imp.* in 7. 8. 2; 8; 9. 2; Mort. 26. 6; with *plup.* in Epit. 22. 5; Mort. 43. 2. Cf. also Ambrose De Off. 3. 14, §87, licet possent; Aug. Civ. Dei 13. 20 licet veterescerent; 14. 12 licet esset; 5. 18 licet vicisset; Carm. Epigr. (B.) 1417. 3 licet mansisset (cf. also Archiv f. lat. Lex. XI (1898), p. 25). *quamvis licet*: cf. Cic. Leg. 3. 24; Har. resp. 9; N. D. 3. 88; Lucr. 6. 600; 620.

§305. *Quandoque* = quandocumque, cf. also Juv. 2. 82; 5. 172; 14. 51.

§306. *Dum* = dummodo, cf. Plaut. Capt. 338. Krueger[3], Bonnell-Meister, Hild, and Peterson say *dummodo* was not used by Quint., but cf. 1. 6. 8 dummodo . . . exeant.

§309. *Cum interim*, cf. Quint. 1. 12. 3; 2. 12. 2; 10. 1. 18; 111; 12. 10. 67, with the indic., and 2. 12. 11; 4. 2. 37, with indef. 2d pers. in subj. (5. 10. 44 *ut cum interim* adferat). Cf. also Sen. Dial. 1. 1. 4; 6. 11. 4; 5; Ira 2. 33. 4; Ep. 17. 1. 6; Plin. Min. 3. 7. 11; 16. 13; 8. 14. 13, with the indic.

§310, 6th line. Namentlich for namentlich.

§314. Quint. uses *quippe cum* also, 10. 1. 38. *Quippe* is used with *quod* 3. 1. 2, and alone in 1. 1. 1 and 11. 5.

§321. *Ut qui* with the superl., cf. also Plin. Min. 9. 22. 2 ut qui verissime.

§326. *Ut sic dixerim* was used 8 times by Quint.: 1. pr. 23; 6. 1; 2. 13. 9; 5. 13. 2; 11; 6. 3. 93; 8. 3. 55; 9. 4. 134; *ut ita dixerim* only 3 times: 1. 12. 2; 9. 4. 61; 10. 2. 15. *Ut sic dicam* is found in 1. 8. 9; 8. pr. 28; 11. 3. 32; 76; and *ut ita dicam* in 8. 3. 37 and 10. 1. 6. *Ut quid* occurs also in Mart. 7. 34. 8; 11. 75. 2.

§327. On *licet ut* cf. Archiv, XI, p. 11, and add Sen. (rhet.), p. 432 (K.), Contr. 9. 5. 8, quoting Gallio: "licet mihi ut prosim vim facere." This is the first occurrence (not joined by Zeugma) of *licet ut*; cf. also Plin. Min. 1. 6. 3 licebit me auctore ut . . . feras, the second occurrence. *Oportet ut*, cf. Macrob. 4. 2. 1; Aug. Civ. Dei 1. 10; 10. 26; 12. 21; 14. 6; Ambrose De Off. 3. 22, §126.

Necesse est ut, cf. Quint. 5. 10. 123 (without *ut* 38 times); Lact. 1. 3. 16; 2. 11. 8; 3. 12. 7; 3. 9. 11; 18. 2; 24. 8; 7. 15. 11; De Ira Dei 1. 15. 7; 16. 3; Ambrose De Off. 1. 20, §87; 2. 8, §41; Aug. Civ. Dei 13. 18; 14. 26; 16. 1; 17. 26; 21. 3 (bis).

§329. *Posco ut*, cf. Juv. 5. 112; 7. 71, and Tac. Hist. 2. 39; 4. 5.

§344. *Nisi si*, cf. also Cic. De Or. 2. 254; 330. Plin. Mai. 14. 115, etc. Quint. 9 times (Bonnell, Index). Seneca De Otio 3. 2 (bis); Petron., §58; Gell. 3. 10. 11; 17. 13. 10.

§347. *Etsi*. Becher, Zum 10. Buch d. Quint. (Progr., 1891), p. 6, cites for Quint. the 4 passages recorded by Kiderlin, Neue Phil. Rundschau, Nr. 6, p. 89, but Quint. uses *etsi* 8 times. Add

Digitized by Google

to his list: 2. 5. 9; 8. 8. 7; 9. 2. 100, and 11. 3. 18. Plin. Min. uses *etsi* 7 times (1. 10. 2; 20. 21; 3. 13. 1; 8. 11. 3; 9. 24. 1; Pan. 63; 90). *Tametsi*, Quint. uses 5 times (add to Bonnell's list I, pr. 11; XII 1. 40), and Plin. Min. 3 times (1. 13. 1; 3. 21. 6; 9. 23. 1). *Etiamsi*, Quint. uses 14 times, Plin. Min. 10 times (1. 8. 5; 2. 4. 4; 16. 2; 3. 9. 37; 5. 8. 6; 9. 26. 2; 28. 3; Pan. 7; 9; 83).

Stilistik.

P. 429. In 'Litteratur,' No. 11, Berger's Stilistik ought to be cited in the *9th* edition (not the 8th), 1896.

§3. The partitive gen. after a neuter plural occurs 76 times in Ennod., 16 times in Claud. Mam., and is frequeut in Prud.

§10. *Magis* with the positive of an adjective, cf. Mart. 1. 48. 3 (mirum); 5. 31. 6 (plana); 8. 53. 4 (pudicam); 12. 24. 2 (gratum). Quint. uses *magis* thus at least 40 times.

§11. Quint. has *longe* with the superl. 20 times and *multo* 3 times (2. 10. 1; 9. 4. 26; 72). With the *compar.* he uses *multo* 28 times and *longe* 4 times (6. 3. 13; 4. 21; 10. 1. 67). With the comparative Plin. Min. uses *multo* 3 times (4. 8. 5; 8. 24. 9; ad Trai. 49. 1), but *longe* 6 times (1. 4. 10; 2. 3. 10; 8. 14. 24; 18. 1; 24. 6; ad Trai. 39. 4); Petron., *multo* twice (§§10, 34), but *longe* 6 times (§§9, 15, 49, 69, 98. 118).

§23. *Quicumque* (= indefinite). Bonnell, Index. Quint., cites 13 occurrences of its use as an adj., 4 as a subst., 3 with a genitive, but omits 10. 1. 105. *Cuicumque eorum*, Mart. 1. 41. 18 uses it in the sense of 'every one.'

§24. *Quisque* = quisquis, cf. Archiv, 8, p. 242, and Wölfflin, Sitzber. d. bay. Akad. 1882, p. 446 f. Cf. also Plaut. Mil. Glor. 156; 460 (and Brix, Niemeyer ad Men. 717).

§26. *Uterque.* Used as a plural by Lact. 4. 12. 15 utrosque adventus comprehendit.

§40. *Haud* occurs only once in Mart. (9. 2. 8). Suetonius' usage is as follows: with *adjectives*, Galba 8, Vesp. 5; Otho 8; with *adverbs*, Caes. 55; Galb. 2; 8; 19; Vit. 14; Vesp. 14; Otho 8; Titus 6; Gram. 4; with *participles*, Galba 2; 19; Titus 10. Seneca, in prose, uses *haud* 15 times, *haut* 3 times, and, in poetry, with *verbs* 17, with adjs. 7, and with adverbs 4.

§41. *Adhuc* with a comparative. Schmalz says 'seit Quint.' Quint. himself shows 17 examples.

§63. Note: *nemini cuiquam*, Suet. Cal. 3.

§70, 2. The statement is made that Quintilian makes almost no use of alliteration ("fast gar keinen Gebrauch von ihr"), and this statement appears in various quarters. But Quint. makes a wider use of alliteration than one would infer from that statement. In books I, II and X the following occur:

a) Between three or more words: I, pr. 14; 2. 10; 3. 5 (*s*ummo *s*olo *s*parsa *s*unt *s*emina); 4. 5; 5. 43 (*p*luribus *p*atronis *p*raeco *p*ronuntiat); 7. 8; 10. 27; 12. 1 (*t*empora *t*amen *t*radi omnia et

Digitized by Google

*p*ercepi *p*ossint). II 2. 8 (*p*lenius *p*raecipueque *p*raeceptoris); 4. 1; 30; 6. 1; 12. 4 (*v*irtutum *v*itiorumque *v*icinia); 16. 8; 21. 9. X 1. 44 (*d*ifferentia *d*isseram *d*iligentius); 59; 3. 2; 5. 21 (*c*onsuetudo *c*lassium *c*ertis); 7. 6.

b) Between adjective and noun occurs 6 times in bk. I, 5 in bk. II, 9 in bk. X.

c) Between subject and verb, 3 times in I, 2 in II, and 4 in X.

d) Between object and verb, 7 times in I, 0 in II, and 6 in X.

e) Between verb and adverb, I 1. 27; 3. 4; 5. 58; 7. 15; II 1. 7; 5. 15; 10. 15; X 1. 110; 6. 7; 7. 29.

f) Between verb and infinitive, I 10. 26; 33; 11. 11; II 1. 12; 2. 14 (*com*ponere *con*amur); 3. 11; 4. 12; 40; 5. 13; 13. 1; 17. 27; X 1. 44; 5. 17.

g) Between two verbs, I 12. 4 (*re*ficiat ac *re*paret); X 5. 17 (*re*ficit ac *re*parat); 7. 17 (*ex*primit et *ex*pellit).

h) Between two nouns, 1. 12. 7; 2. 4. 21; 38; 5. 5; 10. 3. 28; 7. 2.

i) Between two adjectives, 1. pr. 10; 1. 31 *in*offensa atque *in*dubitata; 4. 29; 5. 14; 6. 20 *ab*olita atque *ab*rogata; 15. 1; 10. 5. 21.

j) Between two adverbs, 1. 3. 1 *f*acile et *f*ideliter; 2. 5. 19 *s*tatim et *s*emper.

Alliteration also plays a prominent part in Ausonius and in several of the Christian writers, notably Commod., Paulinus Pell., Cl. M. Victor, and Prudentius, in the last of whom it is to be considered a marked characteristic of his style.

Oct. 12, 1900. EMORY B. LEASE.

Kaiser Julian der Abtrünnige; seine Jugend und Kriegsthaten bis zum Tode des Kaisers Constantius (331–361); eine Quellenuntersuchung von Dr. WILHELM KOCH. Besonderer Abdruck aus dem fünfundzwanzigsten Supplementband der Jahrbücher für classische Philologie. Verlag von B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, 1899. 160 pp. M. 5.

The life of the Emperor Julian is a drama of which the second act has failed to fix the general attention. Philosophers, theologians and phil-Hellenes have succumbed to the fascination of tracing the threads of a mind whose variegation was truly Ionian; they cheerfully resigned to historians the episode of the Gallic campaigns. From Tillemont in the seventeenth century to Naville and Boissier, Julian has been the theme of at least seventy publications,[1] but it is only fourteen years since Hecker (Programm,

[1] See W. Vollert's (incomplete) bibliography in his Kaiser Julians religiöse und philosophische Ueberzeugung (Gütersloh, 1899), published since Koch's work.

Digitized by Google

Kreuznach, 1886) inaugurated the critical study of the sources of his biographers. Hecker's analysis was mainly concerned with the versions of Julian's military exploits to be found in Ammianus Marcellinus, in Libanius, in Eunapius and Zosimus (who may be taken as one), and in Julian himself. It is true that, as early as 1871, Sudhaus (Diss. Bonn.) maintained a common source for Ammianus and Zosimus, but his conclusions attracted little attention.[1] Hecker, on the other hand, by founding a definite theory on debatable evidence, opened a controversy to which Koch has here contributed the latest, but by no means the last, word. Hecker's thesis, which divided the students of Julianic literature into two camps, was that, in addition to his lost *βιβλίδιον*, which, according to Eunapius (frag. 9), was wholly concerned with the battle of Strassburg, Julian composed 'Commentaries,' modelled on Caesar's, and that these were the main source for Ammianus, for the *ἐπιτάφιος* of Libanius, and for the 'Historia nova' of Zosimus; in short, Hecker asserted that the 'Haupt-Quelle' for Julian's biographers is Julian himself. Hecker was followed by Koch, who in his doctor's dissertation (De Iuliano imperatore scriptorum qui res in Gallia ab eo gestas enarrarunt auctore disputatio, Arnheim, 1890) supported the main contention as to the existence and use of the 'Commentaries,' though in details he declined to go all the way with Hecker. Between Koch's dissertation and his present work appeared an admirable article by von Borries (Hermes, 1892), who repudiated the evidence for any such work as the 'Commentaries.' To reproduce his arguments would be beyond the compass of this review. He agrees with Koch and Hecker that Ammianus used the monograph on the 'Alammanen-Schlacht,' regularly cited as the *βιβλίδιον*, the work which earned for Julian at the court of Constantius the nicknames 'loquacem talpam' and 'litterionem Graecum gesta secus verbis comptioribus exornantem' (Amm. XVII 11, 1). This lost monograph, together with certain lost letters of Julian, von Borries calls 'Quelle A.' It is generally agreed that Ammianus did not use the extant Epistula ad Athenienses. Eunapius (216, 6 Dindorf) definitely asserts that Oribasius, Julian's physician, contributed to his history his memoirs of Julian *ὑπόμνημα συνετέλει πρὸς τὴν γραφήν*. According to von Borries, Ammianus also drew on Oribasius, but indirectly, in a version whose authorship he does not attempt to decide. For Oribasius as 'Quelle B,' Koch would substitute Julian's 'Commentaries,' and here he joins hands with Hecker. But why should Eunapius have been content to use and quote

[1] Yet, by reading Sudhaus, Hecker would have been saved from a curious blunder, for which he is ridiculed by Mendelssohn (ed. Zosimus, p. xlvi): oblitus est addere vir doctissimus consensum illum inter Ammianum et Zosimum etiam post mortem Iuliani continuari. quodsi ea concordia cum Heckero explicanda sit eo quod Iuliani commentarios uterque expilaverit, necesse est ut Iuliano praeter alias virtutes etiam ea obtigerit, ut non solum vitae sed etiam mortis propriae narrator fuerit. Sudhaus had pointed out that the agreement lasted after Julian's death.

Digitized by Google

Oribasius, if a work by Julian on the same period had been available? "Eunapius," says Koch (p. 337), "würde nicht im Stande gewesen sein eine so gediegene Arbeit, wie die Julians gewesen sein muss, zu verarbeiten . . . dergleichen Leute können nicht einmal die guten Quellen, die ihnen vorliegen, lesen, weil sie kein Interesse daran haben." The argument from silence never should be pressed, but it is hardly conceivable that Eunapius should not have mentioned Julian's 'Commentaries,' had they existed, as he mentioned the βιβλίδιον in frag. 9.

There are two ways of arriving at the conclusion that Julian wrote 'Commentaries.' With Hecker one may read into Eunapius and Zosimus a reference to such a work. Koch is not inclined to follow Hecker in his theory that Eunap., frag. 9, contains a reference to other works of Julian than the βιβλίδιον; he agrees with von Borries that since Zosimus, III 2, 4, is but a paraphrase of Eunapius, frag. 9, the λόγοι mentioned by him can not, as Hecker thinks, refer to 'Commentaries.' On the other hand, Eunapius (frag. 14) speaks of a certain Cyllenius who had attempted to write of Julian's military achievements. Julian, says Eunapius, wrote a letter to Cyllenius reproaching him with inaccuracies, and describing the events as they actually occurred. In this letter to Cyllenius, Koch (p. 337) would see the introduction to a larger historical work, a continuation of the Strassburg monograph.

While, however, he maintains Hecker's thesis, Koch is more cautious in his use of the evidence; e. g. he agrees with von Borries that the βιβλίον περὶ τῶν ἔργων to which Eunapius refers is probably identical with the βιβλίδιον, whereas Hecker sees here an indication of separate 'Commentaries' by Julian. Koch now withdraws certain suggestions made in his dissertation and criticised by his reviewers, Hecker, Kaerst and Klebs. He gives up (p. 339) the emendation that he proposed for Ammianus, XVI 5, 7 (*tractavit* for Wagner's *amavit*). Ten years ago he saw a reference to Julian's 'Commentaries' in Libanius, I 412 R. and ib. Ep. 525, but now prefers (p. 342) the more conservative view of von Borries. On p. 336 he withdraws his bold suggestion of Ἀλαμμανῶν for Ναρδινῶν in Eunap., frag. 14.

On the whole Koch prefers the second method of proof, and appeals to internal evidence. In Hermes, 1892 (pp. 176–187), von Borries tried to show by parallels that Ammianus and Libanius in the ἐπιτάφιος drew from the same source, and that this source was the βιβλίδιον, since the agreement ended with the battle of Strassburg. Koch asserts that Libanius used not only the βιβλίδιον, but also Julian's 'Commentaries' that dealt with events later than the battle of Strassburg. He repeats his earlier assertion (Jahrbücher, 1893) that parallels with Libanius can be traced through two books of Ammianus after they have ceased for von Borries. To point out indubitable parallels between the rhetorical ἐπίδειξις of Libanius and the plain tale of Ammianus is obviously an illusive enterprise. In a difference of opinion where so much is made to hang on resemblances so shadowy, neither

Digitized by Google

Koch nor von Borries is convincing, and if the existence of the βιβλίδιον depended on this sort of proof we should be reduced to the agnosticism in which we are landed by Koch's affirmation and von Borries' equally emphatic denial of the existence of 'Commentaries.' Koch tries to strengthen his position by the aid of Zonaras. His argument may be reduced to the following: Ammianus and Zonaras conflict; Oribasius was the source for Zonaras; therefore Ammianus did not use Oribasius; therefore he used the 'Commentaries' of Julian. Unfortunately the premises do not stand examination, but there are few fences too high for the Hecker-Koch hobby.

Koch's analysis of the sources, throughout which he assumes the 'Commentaries,' extends from Julian's youth to the death of Constantius, and deserves a more detailed criticism than can be given here. In his discussion of the relations of Constantius and Julian he is on the side of Constantius, whom he regards as the benevolent kinsman whose excellent motives were distorted by the court-party and regularly misinterpreted by Julian.

In spite of Naber's arguments (Mnemosyne, N. S., vol. XI, 1883) for placing the death of Iamblichus as late as 361, scholars are fairly unanimous in rejecting the correspondence with Iamblichus. But his influence on Julian is unquestioned, and it is curious that Koch omits all mention of him in tracing the development of Julian's interest in Neoplatonism and thaumaturgy. It is a moot-point whether Julian twice visited Greece. Vollert, who (op. cit., p. 26) uncritically quotes Ep. 40 to Iamblichus as Julian's, repeats (p. 23) the tradition based on Eunapius that Julian twice went to Athens, his first visit dating immediately after his intercourse with Maximus at Ephesus. Koch, however (p. 362), in spite of Eunap. Vit. Soph., p. 74, concludes that he visited Greece only once, in 355, after the death of Gallus.

That the weakness of the evidence for Julianic 'Commentaries' is not sufficiently recognized has been demonstrated recently in the last volume of Croiset's Histoire de la littérature grecque, where Maurice Croiset, with singular carelessness, writes (vol. V, p. 897): "Nous l'aurions sans doute trouvé (le vrai Julien), très vivant et très naturel, dans les *Commentaires* qu'il avait écrits sur ses campagnes de Gaule, s'ils nous étaient parvenus," and proceeds to cite Eunap., frag. 9, which even Koch rejects as evidence.

Koch's work was translated by himself from the Dutch, for the sake of a wider circulation. There are some bad misprints: σωφροσήνης (p. 354), propogationem (p. 442), and certain misplaced accents and breathings, are harmless irregularities; false references, e. g. 1883 for 1893 (p. 343), are more irritating. A really serious fault on the part of the author is that he quotes his authorities, Eunapius, Libanius, etc., in a German version, a peculiarly undesirable habit where the slightest variation of phrase in the original is of importance.

WILMER CAVE FRANCE.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE, BRYN MAWR, PENNA.

Digitized by Google

Die Elegien des Sextus Propertius, erklärt von MAX ROTHSTEIN. Zwei Teile. Berlin, Weidmann, 1898.

This piece of work fully deserves the warm welcome it has received from every side. Valuable contributions to the study of Propertius had been accumulating for several years, but the last complete commentary to one of the greatest, one of the most interesting, and, certainly, one of the most difficult and obscure of all the Roman poets actually dated back to very near the time when the impossible 'Aurelius' still appeared on the title-page as one of his family-names. It is evident that Rothstein's main, if not his sole, object was to supply this urgent need. Hence other questions, however important in themselves, are relegated, very properly, to a subordinate position. Of course, he, of all scholars, is fully alive to the fact that the text of his author has not yet emerged from the domain of 'the strenuous life'; but a complete and accurate critical apparatus, or an exhaustive discussion of the vexed question of manuscript tradition, much as we need them both, was not within his design. Meanwhile the adoption, substantially, of the Haupt-Vahlen text of 1885 shows good taste and commendable prudence. For, as an editor of texts in general and, certainly, of Tibullus and Propertius in particular, the late Professor Baehrens was not unlike the owl in the old song, "the fairest—in his degree." All who know his work acknowledge gladly the lasting services he rendered to scholarship, but most of us feel that his lack of taste, which was aggravated by the characteristic 'scripsi' of his critical note, inflicted much unnecessary mutilation upon the large number of texts with which his tireless energy brought him in contact.

The defects of Rothstein's edition—if one may use the term at all of a work as welcome and as excellent—seem to spring largely from the attempt to meet fairly the wants of his two classes of readers without, at the same time, going beyond certain rather mysterious limitations set either by himself or his publishers. His general plan (2. 326) of adopting previous views without acknowledgment whenever he agreed with them, and of ignoring those with which he did not agree, is a great and, doubtless, necessary economy of space. Consistency here is certainly a matter of difficulty, since in an author like Propertius so much legitimate controversy is still possible. Rothstein pilots his craft on a surprisingly even keel, but to one who knows the chart, his unusual emphasis, now and then, on certain points, and his indifference on others—as it were, the sudden turn of the wheel this way or that—indicates something not unlike a strong polemical undertow.

The introduction is interesting and suggestive to an unusual degree. Among other things, it is, as far as it goes, a practical demonstration of the importance of studying the elegy as a department rather than by single authors. Every one realizes

Digitized by Google

now that the range of the later elegy is far wider in certain directions and more varied than used to be supposed. One of the most striking examples—noted, in special cases, by several of the elder commentators—is the obvious parallelism of it to comedy in the matter of situations. And I am not sure that the parallelism in situations is not, at the same time, emphasized by a similar tendency to use the popular speech. But, however striking the similarity, we should remind ourselves that parallelism with comedy is by no means, in itself, a proof of derivation from comedy, or of conscious identification with it by the authors of the erotic elegy. So too, speaking of the wide range of the department, if the normal Tibullus comes nearer to the pastoral than anything else in Roman literature, a poem like I 4 ('Priapus de Arte Amandi'), and we might add Propertius, IV (V) 8, is only just around the corner from satire.

Rothstein's discussion of the historical relations of the Alexandrian and Roman elegy is a pleasant and salutary change from the usual glib and cock-sure treatment of this most difficult and obscure literary problem. His position, that, in view of the practically complete wreck of Alexandrian literature, the pedigree of the Roman elegy can not be reconstructed with any certainty, is, no doubt, disappointing to many; but it is well taken, and can not, I believe, be impugned. The question might perhaps be answered if we had even one elegy of Euphorion or of the two chief saints in the calendar of the Roman elegiac poet, Kallimachos and Philetas. Possibly something of the sort may yet turn up in the Land of Buried Treasure, but, until then, a satisfactory solution seems to be impossible. Meanwhile, Rothstein's suggestion that the Lyde of Antimachos was perhaps the real point of departure is certainly worth serious consideration. In theory—and in that age the conscious application of literary theory has to be reckoned with—the Alexandrian elegists seem to have looked upon Mimnermos as their prototype, as the prototype of the elegy itself, in what they considered its primal and proper sphere. Indeed, in their verse-technique they perhaps strove to recover the lost art of the old Ionian masters. Mimnermos, however, came down by way of his townsman, Antimachos, whose compromise with the purely personal note of the older school and the narrative elegy of the future comes nearest to explaining the development of the Roman type.

That Rothstein, doubtless for reasons of his own, should have practically ignored Parthenios in this discussion is, however, a trifle surprising to some of us who had learned to consider as an important 'exhibit' in the case his Περὶ Ἐρωτικῶν Παθημάτων. ('Erotic Experiences,' as we were informed in the introduction to a recent paraphrase of the Cena Trimalchionis. The title 'Erotic Experiences' might well arouse the suspicions of Mr. Comstock, and as a translation of Ἐρωτικὰ Παθήματα it may certainly challenge comparison with that of the English schoolboy who thought that *spicea virga* meant 'the spicy virgin.')

Digitized by Google

In Rothstein's discussion of the life and personal relations of Propertius one observes with pleasure how much the elegy has profited in ten or fifteen years from a recognition of the fact that "a poet is not obliged to tell the truth." The realization that the elegy, though habitually cast in the form of personal experience, is poetry first and biography afterwards, consigns, especially in the case of Tibullus, many a long-winded discussion of supernatural acuteness to the limbo of fruitless 'literature.' At the same time fact and fancy are so blended that, in discussing the reality of any given situation, we must not forget that, in the absence of other proof, positive denial is just as illogical as unqualified faith. After all, one can not even be certain, for example, whether Cynthia was a freedwoman, or what the amiable Seigneur de Brantôme, in a somewhat similar condition of society, used to describe as "une femme honneste et galante." Rothstein says—behind her back—that it is a matter of indifference. But this is mere bravado, as we observe when we reach his commentary. To separate the real Cynthia, a very complex and interesting person, from the literary Cynthia is a pursuit not attended with much scientific profit, but it is too seductive to be resisted by even the stony heart of the professional commentator.

The return of the old four books is a positive pleasure. Lachmann's additional book dragged up from the midst of the text, several different schemes of numbering, and Scaliger's monomania for shifting verses, elegies, and parts of elegies, all united to make confusion worse confounded. Tracing references to Propertius is a source of such constant irritation and loss of time that one welcomes anything tending to uniformity, whether scientific or not.

I have been impressed with the particular excellence, as a whole, of Rothstein's commentary. It is conservative without being dull, fresh and illuminating without being fanciful. Either extreme in a commentator on this author is to be dreaded. The poet's thought, which, as every one knows, is sometimes all but hopelessly obscure, is carefully traced—if anything, too carefully and painfully traced—and there are many valuable notes on his style, a matter of peculiar difficulty in the case of Propertius, whose fervid emulation of Greek was not balanced by the linguistic sanity of Ovid. One does not always coincide with the editor's views, but in every case they are entitled to the most serious consideration.

Every one should be grateful to Rothstein for his valuable and timely work. Too many classical writers are still waiting for the complete modern commentary. Such work is always welcome to the reader, and certainly ought to be—"sunt aliquid manes"—to the author himself, since there is nothing like it for exposing the futility of the average conjectural emendation.

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

Digitized by Google

REPORTS.

PHILOLOGUS, LVI (1897).

I, pp. 1–4. P. Hartwig: Oedipus vor der Sphinx, eine Phylakenscene. The figures on the accompanying vase-fragments from Lower Italy represent a parody of the situation, following perhaps a satyric drama of Euripides, through some lost South-Italian farce.

II, pp. 5–32. F. Dümmler: Sittengeschichtliche Parallelen, treats of certain phases of the phallic rites, etc.

III, pp. 33–70. R. Herzog: Namensübersetzungen und Verwandtes; in the following three categories: 1. Complete giving up of the national name and exchange for one of a different kind with new nationality, i. e. Astarte—Aphrodite. 2. Adaptation of the sound to the new language, i. e. Persian names in Greek dress. 3. Translation, i. e. Θωμᾶς ὁ λεγόμενος Δίδυμος.

P. 70. Cr.: Anthol. Pal. XI 7.

IV, pp. 71–7. H. Lutz: Zur Geschichte Korkyras. 1. Date of the foundation, 734 B. C. 2. Kypselos and the Korkyraeans. 3. Siege of Korkyra and the removal of Timotheos in the summer of 373 B. C.

V, pp. 78–96. O. Schroeder: Pindarica (continuation of Philol. LV 274). III. On the genealogy of the MSS. Summary on p. 93.

VI, pp. 97–117. R. Hildebrandt: Zur Ueberlieferung der Aetna. (*a*) The so-called Gyraldinus. (*b*) The fragmentum Stabulense.

VII, pp. 118–29. W. Soltau: Der Annalist Piso. Summary on p. 129: In Livy's first as well as in the second pentad occur those simple annals, which in their similarity and relative credibility can only be referred to an official and carefully planned reconstruction of the ancient history of the city. They form a connecting link between Piso, the representative of the *annales uetustiores*, and the rhetorical embellishments of the later annalists of Cicero's time, and are perhaps taken directly from Antias, indirectly from the Annales Maximi.

VIII, pp. 130–62. E. Schweder: Ueber die Weltkarte und Chorographie des Kaisers Augustus. II. Die römische Chorographie als Hauptquelle der Geographieen des Mela und des

Digitized by Google

Plinius (continuation from Philol. LIV, S. 534 ff., q. v. for plan). Here S. considers the differences in statement between Mela and Pliny and their bearing on the presumption of a main common source.

P. 162. C. Haeberlin: Plautus, Asinaria 366, reads *promissum*.

IX, pp. 163–6. C. v. Jan: Der Musikschriftsteller Albinus. A contemporary authority cited by Cassiodorus (II 557) for those who could not handle Greek.

X, pp. 167–71. T. Baunack: Zur Inschrift des Soarchos von Lebena (cf. Zingerle, Athen. Mitth. XXI 84 ff.).

XI, pp. 172–7. C. Wunderer: Der Streit um das Sprichwort Λοκροὶ τὰς συνθήκας, Polyb. XII 12ᵃ, gives the explanation of Timaeus which goes back to the paroemiographer Demon and helps to determine the latter's date; the explanation referring the proverb to the Lokri of Lower Italy goes back, without doubt, to Aristotle.

Miscellen.—1, pp. 178–82. A. Mueller: παρεγκύκλημα (cf. p. 181 fin.) has nothing to do with ἐκκύκλημα; acc. to Schol. Aristoph. Nub. 18. 22. 131. 218 and Heliod. Aeth. VII 7 it seems to be a synonym for ἐπεισόδιον.

2, pp. 182–4. M. Thiel: Textkritisches zum dritten Buche der oracula Sibyllina.

3, pp. 184–7. R. Fuchs: Zu den pseudhippokratischen Epidemien.

4, pp. 188–9. R. Fuchs: Κρῆσις. Ionic form, supported by a dozen passages from Hippokrates.

5, pp. 189–92. C. Wunderer: Die älteste Eidesformel der Römer (Polyb. 3, 25, 6). Oath διὰ λίθων—not Δία λίθον—(cf. Livy 30, 43, 9; 1, 24, 8), probably accompanied by a gesture indicative of a curse on the person who breaks the oath.

XII, pp. 193–216: P. Meyer: Aus aegyptischen Urkunden. Meaning of the technical terms κάτοικοι, ἐπίκρισις.

P. 216. Cr.: Zu Greek Papyri Ser. II 38, Gr.-H.

XIII, pp. 217–30. R. Peppmüller: Textkritisches zu Hesiods Erga.

XIV, pp. 231–44. H. Weber: Zu der Schrift περὶ ἀρχαίης ἰητρικῆς, Teubn. Hippokrates, vol. I.

P. 244. C. E. Gleye: Zur Charakteristik des Pseudo-Kallisthenes. Verbal coincidence between Ps.-K. and Plut. vita Alex., and the conclusion that the former was based on the latter's authority, not on popular tradition.

XV, pp. 244–52. G. Albert: Einige coniecturen zu Lucrez.

XVI, pp. 253–89. R. Helm: Fulgentius de aetatibus mundi. Style, vocabulary, etc., show that Fabius Claudius Gordianus Fulgentius, author of de aetatibus mundi, and Fabius Planci-

Digitized by Google

ades Fulgentius, the mythographer, are one and the same person.

XVII, pp. 290–325. W. Liebenam: Curator rei publicae. None mentioned on inscriptions before Trajan. The incumbent was appointed by the emperor among the communities more often of the senatorial than of the imperial provinces, with duties resembling those of an auditor, but with such large discretionary executive powers that he much limited the local independence. The office continued with various changes well into the sixth century.

XVIII, pp. 326–33. J. Miller: Ist Byzanz eine megarische Kolonie? No conclusive evidence for it, from local names, myths and cults. The dialect was Doric (Aristoph. Nubes 249). There are traces of a Corinthian and Boeotian as well as a Megarian settlement, and it is likely that there was such a series of accessions.

P. 333. J. Miller: Die Besiedlung Nordafrikas nach Sall. Jug. 18. False etymologies (*Perorsi* from *Persae*, *Mauri* from *Medi*, *Armua* from *Armenia*, etc.) led to the assumption of an army of Medes, Persians and Armenians—and who so fit to lead them into Africa as Herakles?

XIX, pp. 334–9. J. Kaerst: Ptolemaios und die Ephemeriden Alexanders des Grossen. Arrian's citation (if VII 26. 3 be given its natural interpretation) is not taken from Ptolemy.

XX, pp. 340–54. K. Tümpel: Cheirogastores und Encheirogastores. Not giants, but monsters whose prototype was the polypus. Homer (κ 107) represents them in his Laestrygonians.

XXI, pp. 355–71. W. Hörschelmann: Beobachtungen über die Elision bei Tibull und Lygdamus.

Miscellen.—6, pp. 372–5. F. Bock: In Xenophontis Oeconomicum coniecturarum specimen.

7, pp. 375–8. R. Fuchs: Kritisches zu Galenos.

8, pp. 378–80. L. Gurlitt: Cic. Ep. ad Att. XIII 33. 3, emends to: Tu de Antiocho scire poteris uidelicet iam (*or* etiam) quo anno quaestor aut tribunus mil. fuerit, si neutrum, saltem in praefectis an in contubernalibus fuerit, modo fuerit in bello.

9, pp. 381–2. M. Petschenig: Zu Ammian. Nine emendations.

10, pp. 382–3. G. Schepss: Zu Marius Victorinus de definitionibus. Critical notes.

11, pp. 383–4. Th. Stangl: Zu Cicero's Bobienser Scholien.

XXII, pp. 385–93. Ch. Hülsen: Epigraphisch-grammatische Streifzüge. 1. *Piens.* Such a form in the positive degree belongs not to the vocabulary of the lingua uulgaris, but to the list of masons' and copyists' blunders. 2. *Scalpo—sculpo*; the latter is a late form to be avoided; *sculpo* is used in compounds. In the

Digitized by Google

substantives, *scalptor* and *scalptura* are the correct forms, *sculptor* and *sculptura* being a late spelling.

XXIII, pp. 394–8. E. Samter: Römische Sühnriten. The Trabea, a garment with a purple stripe, was originally a priestly vestment; later it was worn by the knights in the solemn transuectio equitum. The use mentioned by Schol. Aen. VII 612 (ed. Thilo): Trabea est uestis imperialis qua imperator uel consul indutus solebat designare locum ubi civitas aedificanda erat, confirms the theory of the priestly origin.

XXIV, pp. 399–405. H. Jurenka: Epilegomena zu Alkman's Partheneion.

XXV, pp. 406–12. J. Kaerst: Zum Briefwechsel Alexanders d. Gr. Discrepancy between the account of Ptolemaios and that of the letter of Alex. about the battle with Poros. The correspondence can not be used as an important primary source for the history of Alexander.

XXVI, pp. 413–17. W. R. Paton: Ad Pythicos Plutarchi dialogos. Collation of codd. D and F (Paris. 1956–7).

XXVII, pp. 418–25. W. Soltau: Claudius Quadrigarius. Question of Livy's use of his Annals in the 3d decade. The parts of the 21st and 22d books containing accounts of the victories of Hannibal and the treatment of the Roman prisoners after Cannae evidently belonged to the work of Claudius.

XXVIII, pp. 426–91. J. Kromayer: Die Entwickelung der römischen Flotte vom Seeräuberkriege des Pompeius bis zur Schlacht von Actium. Summary on p. 467: Fleet increased from 270 to 500 by year 49–48 B. C. Despite the civil war, it had same proportions in 42. In 38 the number was 700–800; in 36 about 1100. In the 20 years preceding Actium 1500 ships were built, 1000 destroyed. Two appendices: (1) Mithradates' fleet, and the naval strength of the Roman allies; (2) the average number of soldiers on a Roman ship was 80–90 for a trireme, 120 for a quinquereme.

XXIX, pp. 492–524. A. Thierfelder: System der altgriechischen Instrumentalnotenschrift. Both vocal and instrumental notation were alphabetical: the former can be arranged according to a fixed principle, logically carried out; the latter also was evolved from the alphabet, as Thierf. shows.

XXX, pp. 525–34. M. Maas: Liutprand und Juvenal. L. cites J. 8 times, paraphrases 14 times, and seems to have used individual words in 10 instances.

XXXI, pp. 535–41. M. Manitius: Beiträge zur Geschichte römischer Dichter im Mittelalter (continued from Philol. LII, p. 536). 18. Ausonius. 19. Petronius. 20. Seneca. 21. Nux elegia. 22. Calpurnius and Nemesianus.

P. 541. R. Fuchs: Athenaios, VII, p. 324 A.

Digitized by Google

XXXII, pp. 542–50. L. Bloch: Vindiciae Petronianae.

Miscellen.—12, pp. 551–2. K. Prächter: Zur epikurischen Spruchsammlung. Lucr. V 991 uiua uidens uiuo sepeliri uiscera busto, goes back to some saying of Epikouros such as Cod. Vat. gr. 952, f. 91 v., Apophthegm 10 (in Wiener Stud. 1890, S. 4, or cf. 1888, S. 246).

13, pp. 552–4. O. E. Schmidt: Faba mimus (Cic. ad Att. I 16. 13; Seneca, Apocol. 9), would emend to *fatuus mimus*.

14, pp. 555–6. K. Zacher: Iuuenalis, IV 98; cf. Mart. XIII 78. The *fraterculus gigantis* is the charioteer Porphyrio.

15, pp. 556–60. M. Petschenig: Allitteration bei Ammianus Marcellinus.

XXXIII, pp. 561–600. H. Steiger: Warum schrieb Euripides seine Elektra? Answer, on p. 600: "To parody the severely tragic myth of the heroine Elektra and to shatter the idol wrought by Sophokles with insinuating art."

XXXIV, pp. 601–11. A. Rabe: Analysen ausgewählter Abschnitte aus Xenophon's Memorabilien. 1. The first part of the Introduction (I 1). 2. Sokrates' conversation with Aristodemos about God (I 4. 2 ff.). 3. Sokrates' talk with Aristippos about self-control (II 1).

XXXV, pp. 612–15. K. Ohlert: Zur antiken Räthseldichtung.

XXXVI, pp. 616–20. N. G. Dossios: Ueber einige Varianten zu den Pseudophocylidea, from a MS saec. XVI.

XXXVII, pp. 621–51. J. Kaerst: Untersuchungen über Timagenes von Alexandreia. Summary on p. 656: The title of his chief book can not be exactly determined, but that is only a secondary matter. The central feature of his work, which supposedly formed the groundwork of the Historiae of Trogus, was the history of the Diadochoi and Epigonoi.

XXXVIII, pp. 658–713. E. Lange: Die Arbeiten zu Thukydides seit 1890.

Miscellen.—16, pp. 714–21. K. Busche: Zu Euripides Helene. Critical notes, based on H. v. Herwerden's ed. (Leyden, 1895).

17, pp. 721–2. W. Schmid: Das Geburtsjahr des Aelius Aristides, 129 A. D.

18, pp. 722–4. B. Heisterbergk: Noch einmal Prouincia, rejects O. Keller's pro-uindicia.

19, p. 725. J. Ziehen: Zu Cic. ad Att. XII 2. 2.

20, pp. 725–7. F. W. Münscher: Zu Cic. in Cat. IV 24 und 7.

21, pp. 727–8. F. Pfaff: Zwei Bruchstücke aus Ovids Remedia amoris, from a parchment cover (writing of saec. XIV) of a Freiburg MS.

Indices.

YALE UNIVERSITY. GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG.

Digitized by Google

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM FÜR PHILOLOGIE, Vol. LV, pts. 3, 4 (1900).

Pp. 321–40. Aus Julian von Halikarnass. H. Usener. Notes on a Greek commentary to the Book of Job (cod. Par. 454). This was written by Julian, Bishop of Halicarnassus, in the first half of the sixth century.

Pp. 341–7. Die neuen Fragmente griechischer Epoden. F. Blass. The papyrus fragments recently published by R. Reitzenstein (Monatsberichte der Berliner Akademie, 1899, pp. 857 ff.), and ascribed by him to Archilochus, should rather be ascribed to Hipponax.

Pp. 348–84. Zur Topographie von Alexandria und Pseudokallisthenes, I 31–33. Ad. Ausfeld. The Alexander romance of the so-called Pseudokallisthenes was written in Alexandria, probably in the first half of the second century B. C. Next to Strabo's description, it is the most valuable document we possess for the ancient topography of the city.

Pp. 385–413. Studien zu Ciceros Briefen an Atticus. O. E. Schmidt is constrained to lift up a lonely voice against the chorus of praise that has greeted C. F. W. Müller's edition of Cicero's letters. Müller is inconsistent in his use of the MSS; his adnotatio critica is incomplete; in assigning dates to the various letters he has followed Schmidt's chronological tables—without acknowledgment; and he often speaks of Schmidt and his labors in very discourteous phrase. This duty discharged, the writer proceeds with a series of textual notes on the letters to Atticus, continued from vol. LIII, p. 238.

Pp. 414–34. Das Alter der griechischen Sternbilder. E. Bethe. Many of the ancient pictures of constellations found in MSS may be derived from the Ionic art of the sixth century B. C. The name of Orion was given to a particularly bright constellation, much brighter than his record would seem to warrant. Moreover, his constellation is especially important in the ancient farmer's calendar; compare Hesiod, Works and Days, 597–620. Possibly the ancient Boeotians imagined that the mighty hunter made the harvest possible, by driving away the wild beasts.

Pp. 435–59. Zur Handschriftenkunde und Geschichte der Philologie (continued from vol. LIII, 547 f.). R. Foerster. VI. An account of the MSS collected by the Polish humanist, Johann Zamoyski.

Pp. 460–75. Zur Geschichte des Epameinondas. H. Swoboda. A study of the various accounts of the trial of Epaminondas in 369. The writer finds evidence of the existence of a strong peace party at Thebes, which was opposed to the policy of expansion of that day.

Digitized by Google

Miscellen.—Pp. 476–9. J. H. Holwerda, Jr. Homer, Ilias, Z 168, H 175. The *σήματα λυγρά* of Z 168 were hieroglyphics.—Pp. 479–80. W. Bannier. Der Katalog der Dramen des Aischylos.—Pp. 480–81. H. Usener. De Thucydidis l. VII, c. 75. The writer quotes with approval J. M. Stahl's 'emendatio certissima': *οὐκ ἄνευ ὁλολυγῶν [ἐπιθειασμῶν] καὶ οἰμωγῆς.* Compare also II 4, *ὁλολυγῇ.*—P. 481. Ferd. Becher. Ad Ciceronis pro Ligario 2, 5. For '*hic* aequo animo' read '*sic* aequo animo.' Compare Horace's 'sic temere,' C. II 11, 14.—Pp. 481–2. P. von Winterfeld. Lectiones astronomicae.—Pp. 482–3. L. Radermacher. *τοσοῦτος.* The writer defends the *τοσοῦτον* of Eurip. Ion 374.—Pp. 484–5. R. Thurneysen. Altlateinisch *hauelod*? In lines 13–14 of the archaic inscription recently discovered in the Roman Forum many scholars have found the mysterious word 'hauelod.' Thurneysen maintains that the lines on the fourth side of the stone, commonly numbered 12, 13, 14, 15, should be read in the reverse order. Thus he finds in lines 15–14 the phrase *iouestod uelod* (= *iusta uoluntate*, or, possibly, *iusto delectu*).—Pp. 486–7. A. Zimmermann. Noch einmal die Etymologie von *augur*. He connects *augur* with *augustus*.—Pp. 487–8. A. Zimmermann. Wandel von *l* zu *i* im Italischen.—P. 488. E. F. Bischoff. Berichtigungen und Zusätze (to an article in vol. LIV).

Pp. 489–500. Zu Ciceros Ligariana. F. Schöll. Textual notes.

Pp. 501–19. Zu den griechischen Vereinsinschriften. E. Ziebarth. Addenda to the writer's book on this subject (Leipsic, 1896).

Pp. 520–30. Coniectanea. F. Vollmer. Textual notes on the Culex, Ciris, Copa and Halieutica.

Pp. 531–64. Zur Quellenkritik des Thukydides. I. Die erste sicilische Unternehmung. II. Hermokrates. H. Stein.

Pp. 565–73. Zu Avienus. A. Breysig.

Pp. 574–87. Ueber Isokrates, XIII 9–13 und X 8–13. F. Susemihl.

Pp. 588–603. Zu W. Reichels Vorhellenischen Götterculten. H. von Fritze.

Pp. 604–11. Elegie und Komödie (Antwort auf Rothsteins 'Nachträgliches zu Properz'). F. Leo.

Pp. 612–24. Zur handschriftlichen Ueberlieferung des Laertios Diogenes. E. Martini.

Pp. 625–34. Zur handschriftlichen Ueberlieferung Herons von Alexandria. W. Schmidt.

Miscellen.—Pp. 635–41. C. F. W. Müller. Zu Cicero ad Atticum, I 14, 3.—Pp. 641–3. O. Rossbach. Ein plastisches Porträt des Agathokles. A marble head in the Vatican Museum.

WILFRED P. MUSTARD.

Digitized by Google

BRIEF MENTION.

Since the publication of my edition of Pindar's Olympian and Pythian Odes in 1885 much has been written about the dates of Pindar's poems and much new light has been thrown on the subject by recent discoveries, by the finding of the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία*, by the resurrection of Bakchylides, by the bringing out of the Oxyrhynchos papyri, as may be seen by an inspection of the bibliography prefixed to M. CAMILLE GASPAR'S *Essai de chronologie pindarique* (Brussels, 1890); and he who edits Pindar to-day must needs reconsider point after point. The main complaint that M. GASPAR has to make against the recent editors of Pindar is the adherence to the Boeckhian date of the first Pythian, in which the illustrious master followed Pausanias, and not the scholiast, and made the Pythian era begin with Ol. 48, 3, and not Ol. 49, 3. What Pausanias (X 7, 3) calls the *ἀγὼν στεφανίτης* was really the first Pythiad, and this is borne out by the evidence of the three documents already referred to in regard to P. I and VII, O. I, IX, XII. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Otto Schroeder, Pomtow, Baumstark are all on the side of Bergk, who in his third and fourth editions returned resolutely to the date which had been accepted before Boeckh, and M. GASPAR undertakes to show that a sane interpretation of the Pythians is only possible on the assumption of the Bergkian date, the date of the old system.

When the introduction of M. GASPAR'S *Essai* was written, Fraccaroli and Bornemann alone of the recent Pindarists had been faithful to Ol. 49, 3, but while the book was in press there appeared OTTO SCHROEDER'S fifth edition of BERGK'S *Pindar*. SCHROEDER is, as we have seen, an advocate of the Bergkian date, but could only make use of the Oxyrhynchos papyri in his *Addenda et Corrigenda*. Thus he has been brought nearer to an agreement with M. GASPAR at some points, but M. GASPAR, in a tone which seems to be borrowed from the Germans, says that he has found nothing in SCHROEDER that was calculated to modify his own conclusions.

Into the details of these conclusions I can not enter here, not for lack of interest, nor for lack of appreciation of the importance of these chronological studies. In his History of Sicily (II 267),

Digitized by Google

Mr. Freeman is not hazarding much when he says: 'It would be a real gain to historic truth to print the Epinikia of Pindar in chronological order.' But when Mr. Freeman wrote the time for that had not come, and even M. GASPAR himself only hopes 'that the day is not far distant when an agreement more or less definitive will be reached as to the dates of the different odes of Pindar. When that day comes it is to be wished that some editor may be bold enough to break once for all with tradition and routine, and print the odes of Pindar in chronological order.' Such an order would be, as Mr. Freeman insists, a gain to history: it would also be a gain to the study of the poet's art. M. Alfred Croiset has well said, and his words are quoted by M. Gaspar, that 'an ode of Pindar is not a work of pure imagination, created arbitrarily by the enthusiasm of a dreamer. It stands in direct and necessary relation to the circumstances in which it is produced'; and in my way I have insisted much on the character of the odes as occasional poems. But the subtle webs that have been woven between Pindar and his times seemed to me, during the years of my Pindaric studies, so gauzy—not to say, flimsy—that I was haunted by the dictum of Friedrichs, which has been so energetically scouted by those commentators who have wrought most on the historical side. Hence I rebelled against what I could not but regard as the overdoing of historical interpretation, and to me the poems themselves seemed to hold what was essential to the enjoyment of the poetry. Still there is danger in pushing the dogma too far, and, doubtless, I ought to have attacked that side of my task more seriously. As I have just said, the study of the growth of Pindaric art—in which every devotee of poetry must take delight—would gain greatly if we could fix, by historical data, the succession of the odes. But what do we find even after the *Essai de chronologie pindarique*?

The early date of the Tenth Pythian, the late date of the Eighth, give us two fixed points, and much has been made of the signs of youth in the one, of old age in the other. But what of the culmination? 476, the year of O. I, II, III, was a glorious year for Pindar. But the pinion of the Theban eagle sustained him for many years at the soaring height of his genius, and we hesitate to call 476 his apogee, though, if we accept the Bergkian date of his birth, 476 is not far from the conventional ἀκμή, the conventional *floruit* of forty years. P. I, which is put in 470, is unsurpassed. O. VII and O. XIII, assigned to 464, are full of masculine, not of feverish, vigor. At sixty Pindar took his longest flight, in P. IV; and P. V recalls the movement of O. II. For my part, I have not been able to recognize the symptoms of aging in Pindar, which Leopold Schmidt has dwelt upon in such detail. P. VIII is bitter, or, if you choose, austere, but the melancholy of the latest piece is matched by the melancholy of

Digitized by Google

the earliest, as I have noted elsewhere. The shadow is as long in the morning as in the afternoon. But M. GASPAR will not allow P. X to be the earliest, nor P. VIII the latest, of Pindar's poems. According to him, I. VII and [N.] X beside the famous fragment precede the one and [N.] XI follows the other. It is interesting to find that in fixing the date of I. VII M. GASPAR shows a certain happiness in the support of Graff's metrical tests, for which he has shown scant respect elsewhere.

In his *Essai sur la rhétorique grecque* (Hachette), M. OCTAVE NAVARRE has endeavored to trace the lines of connection along which rhetorical studies were transmitted from Sicily to Athens. In this chapter his main source is Diodoros. Thereupon follows a detailed account of the teaching of the sophists, with many of whom rhetoric was the be-all and end-all. In regard to Gorgias M. NAVARRE despairs of saying anything new, and after cataloguing the so-called innovations of the Leontine sophist, he undertakes to show that the Gorgianic figures had their root in the poets that preceded him. Diels had already compared Gorgias and Empedokles; but M. NAVARRE contends that Epicharmos abounds in Gorgianic tricks of style, even more than does Empedokles. For that matter, Aischylos exhibits most of the figures to which Gorgias has attached his name; and in Sophokles these figures are no longer an accessory ornament, but are of the very weft of his style. Indeed, M. NAVARRE would have no difficulty in proving that all the elements of rhetoric are floating in poetry from the beginning. He next attempts to recover from the remains of Antiphon the principles of his τέχνη, which dominates all the rhetoric of his century and beyond. In this M. NAVARRE is not embarrassed by questions of genuineness, and if he were, the fact that all the extant orations show the same controlling technique would have dissipated his doubts. Isokrates, who represents the next stage, introduces the Socratic method, and is called 'the last and the most finished representative of practical rhetoric, such as it was conceived at Athens down to Aristotle.'

The second part of the work consists of an attempt to reconstruct a τέχνη of the fourth century B. C. The substance of it has come down to us in the early Latin treatises in the *ad Herennium* and the *de Inventione*, blended, it is true, with other elements, yet not beyond the possibility of disengagement; and the influence of the τέχνη on the composition of the speech was even more profound than has been supposed. Every Greek speech was under its domination. The treatise closes with a strong plea for the rehabilitation of rhetoric, which, according to M. NAVARRE, is fallen into unmerited neglect in modern France.

Digitized by Google

M. NAVARRE has not burdened his volume with a bibliography, and the references to modern authorities seldom go outside the familiar manuals. Of course, no one is to be blamed for overlooking dissertations, and the readers of Mr. Freeman's Sicily will remember with indulgence his testy remarks on that subject; but sometimes it seems a pity that so much youthful enthusiasm and diligence should be like water spilled on the ground, and M. NAVARRE's book reminds me of a Johns Hopkins dissertation of 1891 by J. C. ROBERTSON, *On the Gorgianic Figures in Early Greek Prose*, which might have given M. NAVARRE some points as to the world-wide influence of Gorgias.

M. NAVARRE'S complimentary reference to the *Littérature grecque* of M. ALFRED CROISET, to whom his book is dedicated, sent me back to the fourth volume of this excellent work, which deals with the Attic orators, among other things, and in rereading it I find, under the head of Antiphon (p. 78), the following remark: '[Antiphon] remplace le verbe usuel par un substantif verbal qui exprime la même idée d'une manière plus neuve et par conséquent plus frappante.' I hope that I shall be pardoned for declining to consider this one of the 'pénétrantes observations' for which M. NAVARRE gives M. ALFRED CROISET credit. The periphrases mean something more than novelty, something more even than ὄγκος, as I have set forth in A. J. P. XVI 525, XX 111; and a good illustration of the ethical effect, of the impressive lesson that character is the result of action, is given by Andokides, I 19: ἔλεξαν ὡς ἐγὼ μηνύσαιμι περὶ τῶν μυστηρίων (which were bad enough) καὶ γενοίμην μηνυτὴς (horror of horrors!) κατὰ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἐμαυτοῦ. This example is all the more interesting because it occurs in the least rhetorical of the orators, one whose Greek is not sicklied o'er by reflection. Less striking and yet quite apposite is an example furnished by Antiphon himself, I 11: ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι τοῦτο μὲν ὁ θέλων αὐτὸς βασανιστὴς γενέσθαι (character), τοῦτο δὲ <ὁ> τούτους αὐτοὺς κελεύων βασανίσαι (mere act) ἀντ' ἐμοῦ. Comp. Aisch. Ag. 225: ἔτλα δ' οὖν θυτὴρ γενέσθαι θυγατρός. But the force of similar periphrases is evident enough in English—as in Shakespeare's 'neither a borrower nor a lender be,' and Ben Jonson's 'If thou beest more, thou art an understander, and then I trust thee.'

That indispensable companion of the student of Greek grammar, MEISTERHANS, *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften* (Weidmann), has appeared in an enlarged and revised edition, under the care of EDUARD SCHWYZER, of Zurich. The enlargement, as the new editor frankly confesses, pertains chiefly to the sounds and the inflections, which have gained sixty pages, whereas

Digitized by Google

the syntax has gained only five. As in the preceding edition, little use has been made of syntactical research in other than inscriptional directions, and the student has been left to draw his own conclusions, though a few words would often have sufficed to mark the difference between the rigidity of legal language and the easy play of prose literature. How far, for instance, the orators were subdued to what they worked in is an interesting question, one side of which was attacked by Fuhr as far back as 1878 in the Rh. Mus. XXXIII 583. Fuhr's statistics seem to need revision, but it is not without significance that the orators, like the inscriptions, make comparatively scant use of τε καί. This coincidence in usage may well be attributed, as he attributes it, to the official character of oratorical discourse. As for τε—τε, MEISTERHANS declares that it is never used in Attic ISS, but the orators use it more freely than one would suppose from Madvig's sharp statement (§485, Anm. 3), though, characteristically enough, unpractical Isokrates is the one who indulges most in the combination.

He who should formulate immediate action for the aorist imperative in prose, and repeated action for the present infinitive, as MEISTERHANS resolutely does for the ISS, would have to force the phenomena (A. J. P. XIII 424); the statistics of Weber show that ἵνα has not vanished from the orators as it has practically done from the ISS; and οὗτος and ὅδε in Attic prose refuse to be bound by the inscriptional law of 'preceding' and 'succeeding' as laid down by MEISTERHANS. The language of the courts, after all, did not dye off much on the texture of the orators, and we must distinguish between the occasional use of a consecrated formula and the habitual set of professional language. But I must content myself here with transcribing from my copy of MEISTERHANS' second edition to my copy of the third (for which I am duly grateful), one or two of the marginal notes. Under §84, 3 d), there is an earlier example of a nominative in a catalogue than any given by Meisterhans: CIA. I 170–73 (422–19 B. C.). See Hicks, No. 50. On ἀρετῆς οὕνεκα καὶ φιλίας (p. 216), Wilamowitz-Möllendorff remarks on H. F.[1] 155: 'Dies denkmal einer hetäre ist plebejisch.' The reference to Dittenberger (p. 257) should be Hermes, XVI 337, and as SCHWYZER has done me the honor of citing my article on the Article with Proper Names (p. 222), I wish he had given the right volume of the Journal, which is XI 483. An odd persistency of a false accentuation is to be noted on p. 203, bottom, where read ἄγκυραι.

Professor OSTHOFF'S *Suppletivwesen der indogermanischen Sprachen* deals with the so-called defective words, such as 'good,' which lacks a comparative and superlative, and 'better,' which

Digitized by Google

lacks a positive, with *fero*, which stops at the present stem, and *tuli*, which serves as a perfect to *fero*. For this phenomenon 'suppletory' or 'suppletive' is a better term than 'defective,' and the questions that rise from the study of these associated groups are of wide and deep interest. Why we say 'bull' and 'cow,' why we say 'horse' and 'mare,' and not 'he-horse' and 'she-horse,' as a German professor of English fancied we did; why the so-called conjugation of τύπτω shifts so often; why φίλος has so many comparatives, and no satisfactory one; why the particular becomes generic; why now this side and now that is turned out,—these are problems that have not escaped the thoughtful teacher, and have attracted the student of language for many years; but the scattered phenomena become much more intelligible by a collective treatment at the hands of an acknowledged master, such as OSTHOFF, who has made over an academic address into a scientific treatise.

Beginning with vol. XI, Harvard University has assumed the publication of *The Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, and henceforth subscriptions should be sent to the Publication Agent, 2 University Hall, Cambridge, Mass. Contents of vol. XI: *De Rebus ad Pompas Sacras apud Graecos pertinentibus Quaestiones Selectae quas instituit* ARTHURUS G. LEACOCK; *Oriental Cults in Britain*, by CLIFFORD HERSCHEL MOORE; *The Form of Nominal Compounds in Latin*, by GEORGE D. CHASE; *Conjectural Emendations of the Homeric Hymns*, by WALTON BROOKS MCDANIEL; *The Death of Ajax: on an Etruscan Mirror in the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston*, by EDMUND VON MACH; *Notes on the Worship of the Roman Emperors in Spain*, by GEORGE CONVERSE FISKE; Συγγενὴς Ὀφθαλμός, by JOSIAH BRIDGE; *Ancient Roman Curb Bits*, by ROBERT EMMONS LEE; *Notes on the Phormio*, by H. W. HAYLEY; *Epigraphica*, by MINTON WARREN; *Indexes*. A word or two on the Pindaric article by Mr. BRIDGE. According to Mr. BRIDGE no change is to be made in the text of P. 5, 17: συγγενής is 'kindred,' not 'native,' ὀφθαλμός is not metaphorical, but literal, and συγγενὴς ὀφθαλμός, as written out, is really ὀφθαλμὸς συγγενοῦς πότμου. The Destiny of the Race is personified, and the Eye of that Destiny is on the members of the family. One is reminded not only of Pindar's δέρκεται (P. 3, 85) and ἐποπτεύει (O. 7, 11), but also of the Psalmist's 'The eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous,' ὀφθαλμοὶ κυρίου ἐπὶ δίκαιον (Ps. xxxiv. 16). The word used, be it noted, is not ὄμμα, but ὀφθαλμός, and Mr. BRIDGE insists on J. H. H. Schmidt's distinction. ὀφθαλμός is not a jewel, like ὄμμα—it is a guiding star. For my part, I find myself unable to accept Schmidt's pretty distinction, and am still unconvinced by his labored attempt to sustain that distinction in the face of Aischylos, Persae 168: ἀμφὶ δ' ὀφθαλμοῖς φόβος· | ὄμμα γὰρ δόμων νομίζω δεσπότου παρουσίαν. In order to be fair to Schmidt, I have kept the MS reading ὀφθαλμοῖς, but the passage evidently

Digitized by Google

points to Xerxes (ἀμφὶ τῷ Ξέρξῃ, Schol. recc.); and with this interpretation we must read after Heimsoeth, followed by Weil and Wecklein, ὀφθαλμῷ. But Mr. BRIDGE sticks to the Schmidtian limitation of ὀφθαλμός, and in the Pindaric passage he gives us the Eye of Destiny, the Masonic Eye, with its perpetual stare, the Eye of the Great King, which winks at us from the Acharnians. As I have said in my commentary on the ode that 'God appears here as πότμος,' I might be expected to favor Mr. BRIDGE'S interpretation. But somehow the figure of Pseudartabas intrudes, and I am affected by Mr. BRIDGE'S Eye of the Destiny of the Race somewhat as Aristophanes seems to have been by the Euripidean 'Foot of Time.'

Professor MICHEL BRÉAL'S interesting and important *Essai de Sémantique*, to which attention was called at the time of its appearance (A. J. P. XVIII 368), has been translated into English by Mrs. HENRY CUST, under the title *Semantics* (Henry Holt). M. BRÉAL'S book deserves the compliment of a translation, but while Mrs. CUST was about it, she might have taken the pains to translate the titles of German books cited by M. Bréal into their original tongue. It is droll to read in an English book of Grimm, *Grammaire*, of Cauer, *Programme du Gymnase de Hamm*, of the *Journal de Kuhn*. As all English-speaking philologians are presumed to know French, the translation is a work of supererogation for the public of this Journal, and for us the *raison d'être* of the book must be the long Preface by Professor POSTGATE (vii–lix) and the appendix by the same scholar 'On the Science of Meaning.'

G. C. K.: Within the last few years a new worker in Greek fable literature has appeared upon the scene in the person of Dr. MICHELE MARCHIANÒ, whose latest book is entitled *L'Origine della Favola Greca e i suoi Rapporti con le Favole Orientali* (Trani, V. Vecchi, 1900. 8vo, xii and 504 pp.). His treatment of the subject is rather superficial but popular in its nature, and the result is a very readable monograph covering a very wide field. After discussing numerous theories as to the origin of the Aesopic fable, he decides in favor of the Greeks. The book is well printed upon good paper with clear type, but extreme inattention to proofreading has produced some startling results, and a strong tendency to normalize the names of modern foreign scholars according to the principles of Italian orthography is evinced by the author.

The appearance of the first fascicle of the great *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, announced in the advertising pages, is an event in philological circles. A detailed account of it is promised for the next number of the Journal.

Digitized by Google

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 812 Broadway, New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Antoninus (Marcus Aurelius), tr. by G. Long, with an introd. by J. L. Spalding. New York, *Appleton*, 1900. Cl., subscr. $3.

Chrysostomus (Joannes). Defence of Eutropius; with notes and vocabulary by E. R. Maloney. Boston, *Allyn & Bacon*, 1900. c. 11 + 44 pp. 16mo, cl., 30 cts.

Epictetus. Discourses; tr. by G. Long, with an introd. by J. L. Spalding. New York, *Appleton*, 1900. c. 21 + 374 pp. 8vo, cl., subscr. $3.

Gleason (Clarence W.) The Story of Cyrus; adapted from Xenophon's Cyropaedia. [Greek text.] New York, *American Book Co.* 202 pp. 16mo, cl., 75 cts.

Greek Dramas by Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides and Aristophanes; with an introd. by B. Perrin. New York, *Appleton*, 1900. c. 25 + 390 pp. Por. 8vo, cl., subscr. $3.

Ovid. Selected Works; with notes and vocabulary; ed. by Frank J. Miller. New York, *American Book Co.*, 1900. c. 528 pp. Il. 12mo, hf. leath., $1.40.

Tacitus. De vita et moribus Iulii Agricolae, et De Germania; with introd. and notes by Alfred Gudeman. Boston, *Allyn & Bacon*, 1900. c. 121 + 295 pp. Maps, 12mo, cl., $1.40.

Virgil. Aeneid; tr. into English by J. D. Long. New il. ed. Boston, *L. C. Page & Co.*, 1900. Il. 8vo, cl., $2.50.

ENGLISH.

Browne (E. G.) Hand-list of Muhammadan Manuscripts in the Library of Cambridge University. London, 1900. 8vo, 440 pp. 15s.

Chaucer Memorial Lectures, 1900. Ed. with introd. by P. W. Ames. London, 1900. 8vo. 6s.

Frankfurter (O.) Elements of Siamese Grammar. Bangkok, 1900. 8vo, x, 141 u. ii pp. 16s.

Grenfell (B. P.) and Hunt (A. S.) Amherst Papyri. Part I: Ascension of Isaiah. London, 1900. 4to. 15s.

Robinson (C. H.) and Brooks (W. H.) Hausa Dictionary. Vol. II. London, 1900. 8vo, 218 pp. 9s.

FRENCH.

Martin (F.) Textes religieux assyriens et babyloniens. *Bouillon.* In-8. 6 fr.

Digitized by Google

GERMAN.

Anglia. Jahrg. 1897–98. Suppl.-Hft. gr. 8. Halle, *M. Niemeyer.*—Petri (Alb.) Uebersicht üb. die im J. 1895 auf dem Gebiete der englischen Philologie erschienenen Bücher, Schriften u. Aufsätze. iii, 151 S. m. 3.

Aristophanis Acharnenses. Cum prolegomenis et commentariis ed. J. van Leeuwen J. F. gr. 8. xviii, 198 S. Leiden, *A. W. Sijthoff.* m. 5.

Bacher (Wilh.) Ein hebräisch-persisches Wörterbuch aus dem 14. Jahrh. Progr. gr. 8. iii, 135 u. 76 S. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner.* m. 4.

Beck (Frdr.) Untersuchungen zu den Handschriften Lucans. Diss. gr. 8. iii, 75 S. München, *A. Buchholz.* m. 1.80.

Beiträge, Bonner, zur Anglistik. Hrsg. v. M. Trautmann. 6. Hft. gr. 8. Bonn, *P. Hanstein.*—6. Brown (J. T. T.) The Wallace and The Bruce Restudied. viii, 174 S. m. 4.50.

—— Wiener, zur englischen Philologie. Hrsg. v. J. Schipper. XII. Bd. gr. 8. Wien, *W. Braumüller.*—XII. Richter (Helene). Thomas Chatterton. x, 258 S. m. 6.

Berneker (Erich). Die Wortfolge in den slavischen Sprachen. gr. 8. xi, 161 S. Berlin, *B. Behr's Verl.* m. 6.

Bibliotheca normannica. Hrsg. v. Herm. Suchier. III. gr. 8. Halle, *M. Niemeyer.*—III. Marie de France: Die Lais, hrsg. v. Karl Warnke. Mit vergleich. Anmerkgn. v. Rhold. Köhler. 2. Aufl. xi, clx, 303 S. m. 12.

Bion v. Smyrna. Adonis. Deutsch u. griechisch von Ulr. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. 8. iii, 48 S. Berlin, *Weidmann.* m. 1.

Blaydes (F. H. M.) Adversaria critica in Euripidem. gr. 8. vii, 544 S. Halle, *Buchh. des Waisenhauses in Komm.* m. 10.

Brandstetter (Renward). Drei Abhandlungen üb. das Lehnwort. Progr. 4. 68 S. Luzern, *Räber & Co.* m. 1.20.

Brönnle (Paul). Contributions towards Arabic Philology. Part I: The Kitâb al-Maḳṣûr Wa'l-Mamdud by Ibn Wallâd. Ed. with introduction, commentary and indices. gr. 8. viii, 167 S. Leiden, *Buchh. u. Buchdr. vorm. E. J. Brill.* m. 6.

Corpus antiquissimorum poetarum Poloniae latinorum usque ad Ioannem Cochanovium. Vol. V, 2 partes. gr. 8. Krakau, *Buchh. der poln. Verlags-Gesellschaft.*—V. Royzii Maurei (Petri) Alcagnicensis, carmina. Ed. Bronisl. Kruczkiewicz. 2 partes. cxxxviii, 311 u. x, 512 S. m. 12.

Deubner (Ludov.) De incubatione capita quattuor. gr. 8. v, 138 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.* m. 5.

Eichhorn (A.) Ein Hymnus auf das Venusgestirn in Na-ual-Bildschrift. gr. 4. 172 S. m. Abbildgn. u. 1 Taf. Berlin, *A. Asher & Co.* m. 12.

Elegiker, Römische. Eine Auswahl. Für den Schulgebr. bearb. v. K. P. Schulze. 4. Aufl. gr. 8. xiv, 354 S. Berlin, *Weidmann.* m. 3.

Erasmi, Desiderii, Roterodami, colloquia familiaria. Floril. composuit N. J. Singels. 8. vii, 180 S. Groningen, *J. B. Wolters.* m. 2.

Festschrift, Johannes Vahlen zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet v. seinen Schülern. gr. 8. ix, 700 S. Berlin, *G. Reimer.* m. 24.

Forschungen, anglistische. Hrsg. v. Johs. Hoops. 1. Hft. gr. 8. Heidelberg, *C. Winter.*—1. Stoffel (C.) Intensives and Down-toners. A study in English adverbs. iii, 156 S. m. 4.

Digitized by Google

Forschungen, romanische. Organ f. roman. Sprachen u. Mittellatein, hrsg. v. Karl Vollmöller. XII. Bd. 3. Hft. gr. 8. iii u. S. 491–931. Erlangen, *F. Junge.* m. 16.

Grienberger (Thdr.) Untersuchungen zur gotischen Wortkunde. [Aus 'Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss.'] gr. 8. 272 S. Wien, *C. Gerold's Sohn in Komm.* m. 5.80.

Grumme (Alb.) Ciceronis orationis Milonianae dispositio. Ed. II. gr. 8. 15 S. Gera, *H. Kanitz' Verl.* m. —40.

Grundriss der indo-arischen Philologie u. Altertumskunde. Begr. v. Geo. Bühler, fortges. v. F. Kielhorn. I. Bd. 8. u. 10. Hft. gr. 8. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner.*—I 8. Pischel (R.) Grammatik der Prākrit-Sprachen. 430 S. m. 21.50.—I 10. Geiger (Wilh.) Litteratur u. Sprache der Singhalesen. 97 S. m. 5.

Hommel (Fritz). Aufsätze u. Abhandlungen. II. Mit 16 Abbildgn. in Zinkotyp. gr. 8. S. 129–272. München, *H. Lukaschik.* m. 13.50.

Hübner (Aemil.) Inscriptionum Hispaniae christianarum supplementum. gr. 4. xvi, 162 S. m. Abbildgn. Berlin, *G. Reimer.* m. 24.

Jagić (Vratoslav). Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der kirchenslavischen Sprache. 2. Hälfte. [Aus 'Denkschr. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss.'] gr. 4. 96 S. Wien, *C. Gerold's Sohn in Komm.* m. 5.60.

Lexicographi graeci recogniti et apparatu critico instructi. Vol. IX. gr. 8. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.*—IX. Pollucis onomasticon. Edidit et adnotavit Ericus Bethe. Fasc. I. xx, 305 S. m. 14.

Materialien zu e. Geschichte der Sprachen u. Litteraturen des vorderen Orients. Hrsg. v. Mart. Hartmann. 1. Hft. gr. 8. Heidelberg, *C. Winter.* —1. Makas (Hugo). Kurdische Studien. 1. Eine Probe des Dialektes v. Diarbekir. 2. Ein Gedicht aus Gāwar. 3. Jezidengebete. viii, 54 S. m. 4.

Meisterhans (K.) Grammatik der attischen Inschriften. 3. Aufl., besorgt v. Ed. Schwyzer. gr. 8. xiv, 288 S. Berlin, *Weidmann.* m. 9.

Murad (Frdr.) Arabat u. Masis. Studien zur armen. Altertumskunde u. Litteratur. gr. 8. iii, 104 S. Heidelberg, *C. Winter.* m. 7.

Muss-Arnolt (W.) A Concise Dictionary of the Assyrian Language. (Assyrian-English-German.) Part 9. gr. 8. S. 513–76. Berlin, *Reuther & Reichard.* m. 5.

—— Assyrisch-englisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch. 9. Lfg. gr. 8. S. 513–76. Ebd. m. 5.

[Odo.] Odonis abbatis Cluniacensis occupatio. Primum ed. Ant. Swoboda. 8. xxvi, 173 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.* m. 4.

Palaestra. Untersuchungen u. Texte aus der deutschen u. engl. Philologie. Hrsg. v. Alois Brandl u. Erich Schmidt. XI. gr. 8. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller.* —XI. Gautrekssaga, Die, in zwei Fassungen hrsg. v. Wilh. Ranisch. vii, cxii, 76 S. m. 5.50.

Peire's v. Auvergne Lieder, kritisch hrsg. m. Einleitg., Uebersetzg., Kommentar u. Glossar v. Rud. Zenker. gr. 8. x, 266 S. Erlangen, *F. Junge.* m. 4.

Rolandslied, Das altfranzösische. Kritische Ausg., besorgt v. E. Stengel. I. Bd. gr. 8. ix, 404 S. Leipzig, *Dieterich.* m. 12.

Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialekte. Hrsg. v. Wilh. Braune. I. gr. 8. Halle, *M. Niemeyer.*—I. Braune (Wilh.) Gotische Gram-

Digitized by Google

matik m. einigen Lesestücken u. Wortverzeichnis. 5. Aufl. viii, 163 S. m. 2.80.

Saxo Grammaticus: Die ersten neun Bücher der dänischen Geschichte. Uebers. u. erläutert v. Herm. Jantzen. 2. Hft. gr. 8. xix u. S. 161–533. Berlin, *E. Felber*. m. 8; kplt., m. 12.

Schönbach (Ant. E.) Studien zur Geschichte der altdeutschen Predigt. 2. Stück. Zeugnisse Bertholds v. Regensburg zur Volkskunde. [Aus 'Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss.'] gr. 8. 156 S. Wien, *C. Gerold's Sohn in Komm.* m. 3.40.

Studien zum germanischen Alliterationsvers. Hrsg. v. Max Kaluza. 4. Hft. gr. 8. Berlin, *E. Felber*.—4. Kuhnke (Bruno). Die alliterierende Langzeile in der mittelenglischen Romanze Sir Gawayn and the Green Knight. 88 S. m. 3.

Suchier (Herm.) Die Handschriften der castilianischen Uebersetzung des Codi. Progr. gr. 4. 22 S. m. 6 Lichtdr.-Taf. Halle, *M. Niemeyer*. m. 3.

Texte, Irische, m. Uebersetzungen u. Wörterbuch. Hrsg. v. Wh. Stokes u. E. Windisch. 4. Serie. 1. Hft. gr. 8. xiv, 438 S. Leipzig, *S. Hirzel*. m. 12.

Texts, Old and Middle English. Ed. by L. Morsbach and F. Holthausen. Vol. I. gr. 8. Heidelberg, *C. Winter*.—I. Havelok. Ed. by F. Holthausen. xii, 101 S. m. 2.40; geb., m. 3.

Thesaurus linguae latinae. Editus auctoritate et consilio academiarum quinque germanicarum. (In ca. 12 Bdn.) Vol. I. Fasc. 1. Imp. 4. xiv S. u. Sp. 1–224. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. Subskr.-Pr., m. 7.20.

Tolkiehn (Johs.) Homer u. die römische Poesie. gr. 8. vi, 219 S. Leipzig, *Dieterich*. m. 6.

Tragödien, griechische. Uebers. von Ulr. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. I. 8. Berlin, *Weidmann*. Geb., m. 1.—I. Sophokles: Oedipus. 2. Aufl. 84 S. m. 1.

Vondrák (W.) Altkirchenslavische Grammatik. gr. 8. xi, 395 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. m. 9.

Wagner (Otto). Incerti auctoris epitome rerum gestarum Alexandri Magni. E codice Mettensi edidit. [Aus 'Jahrbb. f. class. Philologie.'] gr. 8. S. 93–167. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 3.

Walde (Alois). Die germanischen Auslautgesetze. Eine sprachwissenschaftl. Untersuchg. m. vornehml. Berücksicht. der Zeitfolge der Auslautsveränderg. gr. 8. v, 198 S. Halle, *M. Niemeyer*. m. 5.40.

Wartensleben (G. v.) Begriff der griechischen Chreia u. Beiträge zur Geschichte ihrer Form. gr. 8. 142 S. Heidelberg, *C. Winter*. m. 3.60.

ITALIAN.

Calvagna (Nunzio). Sulla epigrafia dell' età imperiale. Parte I. Aquila. 8vo, p. 116. L. 4.

Marchianò (Michele). L'origine della favola greca ed i suoi rapporti con le favole orientali. Trani. 16mo, p. 514. L. 7.

Nicastro (P.) Étude sur la conjugaison française. Ragusa, 1899. 8vo, 193 pp. L. 6.

Sganga (Gioachino). Il romanzo e la forma poetica più conveniente ai tempi nostri. Vol. I. Palermo. 8vo, p. 62. L. 1.25.

—— Poeti latini malamente interpretati. Palermo. 8vo, p. 113. L. 2.

Digitized by Google

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Abbott (Frank F.) The Use of Repetition in Latin to secure Emphasis, Intensity, and Distinctness of Impression. (Chicago Studies in Classical Philology.) Chicago, *The University of Chicago Press*, 1900.

Arnold (E. V.) The Rigveda. (Popular Studies in Mythology, Romance and Folklore. No. 9.) London, *D. Nutt*, 1900. @ 6d.

Bréal (Michel). Semantics: Studies in the Science of Meaning. Translated by Mrs. Henry Cust. With a preface by J. P. Postgate. New York, *Henry Holt & Co.*, 1900.

Deiter (H.) Uebungsstücke zum Uebersetzen ins Griechische im Anschluss an die Lektüre von Xenophon's Anabasis, I–IV. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1901. 60 pf.

De Visser (M. W.) De Graecorum diis non referentibus humanam speciem. (Leyden Dr. Diss.) Lugduni-Batavorum, *Los*, 1900.

English Dictionary, The Oxford. Ed. by J. A. H. Murray. INPUT–INVALID (Vol. V). Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*. 5s.

Euripides. Cyclops. Ed. with a prefatory essay, rhythmical scheme of the lyric parts, and exegetical and critical notes. By John Patterson. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1900.

Gale (Harlow). The Vocabularies of Three Children of One Family to two and a half years of age. (Reprint from 'Psychological Studies,' no. 1.) Minneapolis, *The Author*, 1900. 75 cts.

Gaspar (Camille). Essai de chronologie pindarique. Bruxelles, *H. Lamertin*, 1900.

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology. Vol. XI. Cambridge, U. S. A., *Harvard University*, 1900. $1.50.

Havelok. Ed. by F. Holthausen. Old and Middle English Texts; ed. by L. Morsbach and F. Holthausen. New York, *G. E. Stechert*, 1901. Cl., $1.

Hendrickson (George L.) Horace, Serm. I 4: A Protest and a Programme. (Reprint from 'A. J. P.' XXI 2.) 1900.

Hermes. Zeitschrift für classische Philologie. Herausg. v. G. Kaibel u. Carl Robert. XXXV. Bd. 4. Heft. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1900.

Hoeing (Charles). The Codex Dunelmensis of Terence. (J. H. U. Diss.) (A. J. Archaeology, V 3.) 1900.

Huebner (Aemilius). Inscriptionum Christianarum supplementum. Ed. Aem. H. Berolini, *Typis et impensis Georgii Reimeri*, MCM.

Jackson (Henry). On Some Passages in the Seventh Book of the Eudemian Ethics attributed to Aristotle. *Cambridge University Press*, 1900.

Jahreshefte des österreichischen archäologischen Institutes in Wien. Bd. III. Heft 1. Wien, *Alfred Holder*, 1900.

Καββαδίας (Π.) Ἱστορία τῆς ἀρχαιολογικῆς ἑταιρείας. Ἀθήνησιν, 1900.

Digitized by Google

Kuhn (M. C.) Elements of Spoken French. New York, *American Book Co.*, 1900. 50 cts.

Little (Charles Edgar). A Grammatical Index to the Chāndogya-Upaniṣad. (The Vanderbilt Oriental Series.) New York, *The American Book Co.*, 1900. $2.

Livi (T.) Ab urbe condita. Ed. Antonius Zingerle. Pars VII. Fasc. II. Lib. XXXI. Ed. Mai. Lipsiae, *G. Freytag*, 1901. 1 m. 80 pf.

Luňák (D.) De paricidii vocis origine. Odessa, 1900.

Macé (Alcides). De emendando differentiarum libro qui inscribitur De proprietate sermonum et Isidori Hispalensensis esse fertur. Paris, *Albert Fontemoing*, 1900.

McEwan (E. J.) The Essentials of the English Sentence. Boston, *D. C. Heath & Co.*, 1900.

Marchianò (Michele). L'origine della favola greca e i suoi rapporti con le favole orientali. Trani, *V. Vecchi*, 1900.

Maryland Geological Survey. Allegany County. Baltimore, *The Johns Hopkins Press*, 1900.

Modern Language Association of America (Publications of the). Ed. by James W. Bright. (N. S., Vol. VIII, No. 4.)—XV. Kittredge (G. L.) The Friar's Lantern and Friar Rush.—XVII. Florer (W. W.) Gender-Change from Middle High German to Luther. Baltimore, *The Association*, 1900.

Muret-Sanders. Encyclopädisches Wörterbuch der englischen u. deutschen Sprache. Teil II: Deutsch-Englisch. Lfg. 19: Scheiben–Seifen-. New York, *The International News Co.* @ 1 m. 50 pf.

National Educational Association. Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the Thirty-ninth Annual Meeting, held at Charleston, S. C., July 7–13, 1900. Chicago, *The Association*, 1900.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte u. deutsche Litteratur u. für Paedagogik. Herausg. v. J. Ilberg u. Rich. Foster. V. u. VI. Bandes 8. Heft. Leipzig, *Teubner*, 1900.

Onomasticum Taciteum. Composuit Philippus Fabia. (Annales de l'Université de Lyon. Nouvelle Série. II. Fasc. 4.) Paris, *Fontemoing*, 1900.

Osiander (Wilhelm). Der Hannibalweg neu untersucht. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1900. 8 m.

Penniman (James H.) New Practical Speller. Boston, *D. C. Heath & Co.*, 1900.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Herausg. v. F. Buecheler u. Hermann Usener. N. F. LV 4. Frankfurt a/M., *Sauerländer*, 1901.

Römische Elegiker. Eine Auswahl aus Catull, Tibull, Properz u. Ovid. Bearb. v. K. P. Schulze. 4te Aufl. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1900. 3 m.

Schanz (M.) Römische Litteraturgeschichte. II 2. 2te Auflage. Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, hrsg. v. Iwan v. Müller. München, *C. H. Beck*, 1901. 17 m. 50 pf.

Schlicher (J. J.) The Origin of Rhythmical Verse in Late Latin. (Chicago Diss.) Chicago, Ill., 1900.

Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis. Caesaris Commentarii de Bello Gallico. Recens. R. L. A. Du Pontet. 2s. 6d.

Digitized by Google

—— Vergili (P.) Maronis Opera. Recogn. F. A. Hietzel. 3s. 6d. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*, 1900.

Stoffel (C.) Intensives and Down-toners. A study in English adverbs. (Anglistische Forschungen. Herausg. v. Johannes Hoops.) Heidelberg, *Carl Winter*, 1901. 4 m.

Tacitus. Agricola and Germania. With introduction and notes. By Alfred Gudeman. Boston, *Allyn & Bacon*, 1900. $1.40.

Thomas (F. D.) The *D*-Suffix. (Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society.) London, *C. J. Clay & Co.*, 1900. 3s.

Vendryes (M. J.) L'imparfait du subjonctif en moyen-gallois. (Mémoires de la Société de linguistique de Paris, tome XI.)

Weil (H.) Un nouveau prologue de comédie. (Revue des études grecques.) Paris, *E. Leroux*, 1900.

Wheeler (Benj. Ide). The Place of Philology. (Reprint from 'The (California) University Chronicle, III 5.) Nov. 1900.

v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (U.) Reden u. Vorträge. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1901. 6 m.

Digitized by Google

INDEX TO VOL. XXI.

Achaean-Doric κοινή, so-called, Source of, 183–6
Actium, Battle of, 94
Aeolic Epos of the Wrath of Achilles, 99–100
Aeschylus, Second Achilles trilogy, 346
Alcaeus 5, 97
Alexander sarcophagus of Sidon, 96
Alexandria, Topography of, 468
Alexis, Date of, 59, 60
Allen's Treatment of Nature in the Poetry of the Roman Republic (rev.), 91–3
Ancren Riwle, Fragment of the, 336
Annales Maximi, Origin of, 346
Antiphanes, Date of, 54–8
Any = quantusvis, 225
Apáth Napát Again, 274–86
Apollodori, The two, Date of, 45–50
Arcadia, History of, 98
Areopagus and Pleiade, 339, 340
Aristomenes Comicus, Date of, 52–4
Aristophanes, Acharnians 947, 433–7
Frogs, Second performance of, 346
Plut. 1030, 98
Aristotelian Katharsis, 100, 101
Aristotle's Metaphysics, 344
Arrian 7, 26, 3, 465
Asklepios' Sanctuary at Epidauros, 108
Athenian Democracy in the Light of Greek Literature, 361–77

Babrius, A metrical law in, 347
CXXIII 1, 345
Beiträge zur Assyriologie, Report of, 103–6
Benedictine Rule, MSS of, 225
Bennett, Critique of some recent subjunctive theories, 221
Bennett's Critique of Some Recent Subjunctive Theories (rev.), 80–91
Birds of O.E. Literature, 335
BLOOMFIELD, MAURICE. On the Wedding Stanza, Rig-Veda x. 40. 10, 411–19
Review of Monier-Williams' Sanskrit-English Dictionary, 323–7
BOLLING, GEORGE MELVILLE. Etymology of σθένος, 315, 316
BONNER, CAMPBELL. Note on Aristophanes, Acharnians 947, 433–7
Books Received, 116–20, 239–40, 358–60, 481–3

Brief Mention:
Cust's Translation of Weil's Sémantique, 476
Engelmann's Tragischer Atlas, 233
Gaspar's Essai de chronologie pindarique, 470
Gloth and Kellogg's Index in Xenophontis Memorabilia, 354
Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, 475
Hyslop's Euripides' Andromache, 232, 233
Imelmann's Donec gratus eram tibi, 108
Kavvadias, The Sanctuary of Aesculapius at Epidauros, 107–8
Lidén's Studien zur altindischen u. vergleichenden Sprachgeschichte, 112
Marchianò's L'origine della favola greca, 476
Meisterhans, Attische Inschriften, 473
Merry's Aristophanes' Peace, 229 foll.
Navarre's Essai sur la rhétorique grecque, 472
Osgood's Classical Mythology of Milton's English Poems, 234
Osthoff's Suppletivwesen, 474
Oxford Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca, 110
Pallis's Version of the Iliad, 233
Reiter's Euripides auf Tauris, 111, 112
Sandys' Demosthenes on the Peace, 110
Walker's Sequence of Tenses, 109
Weil's Études sur l'antiquité grecque, 235
Wilhelm on ἕτος and ἐνιαυτός, 353
Brugmann's Griechische Grammatik, 3te Aufl. (rev.), 317–22
BUCK, CARL D. The Source of the So-called Achaean-Doric κοινή, 193–6
Review of Brugmann's Griechische Grammatik, 317–22
Byzantium a Megaric colony? 465

Caesar's Gallic War, Sequence of Tenses in, 109
Caligula and the temple of the Didymean Apollo, 220
Callirhoe, Site of, 98
Callisthenes, Pseudo-, 464
CAPPS, EDWARD. Chronological Studies in the Greek Tragic and Comic Poets, 38–61

Digitized by Google

Catasterismi, The, 96
Catullus, II 8, XI 11, 78
XXIX 20, XXIX 23, 79
The Codex Romanus of, 95
Celtic Traces in the Glosses, 188–96
Cephisodotus and Cephisodorus, Date of, 50–52
Charon, originally a dog, 96
Chaucer, Dissyllabic Thesis in, 227
Chaucer's Troilus, Sources of, 339
Chronological Studies in the Greek Tragic and Comic Poets, 38–61
Chrysippus, the Pindaric commentator, 101
Chrysostomus, Dio, Or. 43, Date of, 55
Chthonic Gods of Greek Religion, 241–59
Cicero ad Att. XIII 33, 3 (em.), 465
pro Ligario 2, 5 (em.), 469
Letters, The Greek in, 387–410
MSS of, in Vatican Library, 420–32
Timaeus, 99
Use of Subjunctive in *si*-clauses, 260–73
Claudius Quadrigarius, 466
CLEMENT, WILLARD K. Prohibitives in Silver Latin, 154–69
Cleobulina, a figment, 95
Comic Poets, Chronological Studies in the Greek, 45–61
Conditional sentence in Latin, 260–73
Constellations, Greek, 468
Corcyra, History of, 463
Cowley's Davideis, 340–41
Curator rei publicae, 465

Democracy, Athenian, in the Light of Greek Literature, 361–77
Demogorgon, 235
Demosthenes, IX 48, 110, 111
and the Thessalian Hieromnemones, 220
Deukalion, orig. Leukarion, 345
Dio Chrysostomos, Life of, 96
Dionysion *ἐν Αἰμναις*, 345
Diphilus and Plautus, 102
Do, The auxiliary, 223

Eclipses and deaths, 102
Elizabethan Plays, Notes on, 334
ELLIS, ROBINSON. Notes on the Recently Discovered Elegy of Poseidippus, 76–7
ELMER, H. C. Review of Bennett's Critique of Some Recent Subjunctive Theories, 80–91
Engelmann's Tragischer Atlas (noticed), 234
English grammar, Contributions to, 223
phonetics, 438–42
Enneakrunos, Topography of, 345
Epaminondas, 468
Epicurean apophthegms, 487
Etruscan inscription, 99
Etymological miscellany, 178–82
Etymology and Slang, 197–9
Euripides, Andr. 848, 103
Bacchae 1300, 98
Electra, Object of, 467
Helena 1155–1160, 344
The myth in, 348
Phoen. 1255, 98

FAIRBANKS, ARTHUR. The Chthonic Gods of Greek Religion, 241–59
Fairie Queene and Huon of Burdeux, 336
FAY, EDWIN W. Etymology and Slang, 197–9
Notice of Lidén's Studien zur altindischen u. vergleichenden Sprachgeschichte, 112
FOWLER, FRANK H. On Greek and Latin Negatives, 443–5
Fulgentius, 464

Gaspar's Essai de chronologie pindarique (noticed), 470
Gâthic Pahlavi, Items from the, 287–93
Ghost words, O.E., 338
Gibbon's Letters, 338–9
GILDERSLEEVE, B. L. Report of Rheinisches Museum, 99–103
See also *Brief Mention*.
Gloth and Kellogg, Index to Xenophon's Memorabilia (noticed), 354
GOODSPEED, EDGAR J. A Papyrus Fragment of Iliad E, 310–14
Grammatical gender, Origin of, 341–3
GRAY, LOUIS H. Indo-Iranian Studies, 1–22
Greek: *γαιτάνα* 'ass'? *τἀφροντίζειν*, 349; *διά* added to compds. after *καί*, 101; *τδραχμίον*, 349; *ἐνάρξασθαι δεκάεσσιν*, 17; *ἔτος* and *ἐνιαυτός*, 353; *κρῆσις*, 464; *παρέγκυκλημα*, 464; *ὥστ' οὐ* c. inf., 110, 111.
Greek etymologies: *ζόφος*, *κλοιός*, *κύκνος*, *μάργος*, 179; *οὐ*, 443; *σμίλη*, *σκεύδω*, 181; *σθένος*, 315; *τῖλος*, 180; *ὕλη ὑλίζω ὕμνος*, 181; *φριμάω*, 182.
Greek constellations, 468
in Cicero's Epistles, 387–410
Grammar, Brugmann's (rev.), 317–22
Melic Poets, Smyth's (rev.), 327–31
musical notation, 466
rhetoric, 472
Romance, Petronius and the, 97
Stage, 345
Grenfell's Erotic Fragment, 346
GRUENER, GUSTAV. Report of Journal of Germanic Philology, 334–43

Harvest customs, Ancient, 436
HEMPL, GEORGE. The vowel-sounds in 'are,' 'father,' 'rather,' '(n)either,' 'key,' 438–42
Hench, George A., Necrology of, 343

Digitized by Google

HENDRICKSON, G. L. Horace, Serm. I 4: a protest and a programme, 121–42
Heraclitus, Parmenides and, 200–16
Herodas, Mim. II, 108
Hippolytus, MSS of, 97
Hipponax, not Archilochus, 468
Hölderlin and Keats, 226
Homer, Il. VI 168, 469
XXII, XXIII, 99
Hieroglyphics in, 469
Tennyson and, 143–53
HOPKINS, WASHBURN. The Ocean in Sanskrit Epic Poetry, 378–86
Horace, Epod. 9, 19–20, 228
Serm. I 4, 121–42
Translations of, 108
Hude's Thucydides, 218
HUMPHREYS, MILTON W. Report of Revue de Philologie, 217–23
Huon of Burdeux, The Faerie Queene and, 336
Hyslop's Euripides' Andromache (noticed), 232

Imelmann's Donec gratus eram tibi (noticed), 108
Imprecation, Figures of, 223
Intercessory work of the saints, 108

Johannes Antiochenus, Archetype of MSS of, 96
JOHNSON, C. W. L. Review of Weil et Reinach, Plutarque, De la Musique, 331–3
Journal of Germanic Philology, Report of, 334–43
Juvenal, Liutprand and, 466

Katharsis, The Aristotelian, 101, 102
Kavvadias' Sanctuary at Epidauros (noticed), 107–8
Keats, Hölderlin and, 227
KELLOGG, GEORGE DWIGHT. Report of Philologus, 344–9, 463–7
Κηρύκιον, The star, 98
Kingis Quair, Authorship of, 224
KIRK, W. H, De *quoque* adverbio, 303–9
KURRELMEYER, W. The Wenzelbibel, 63–75

LAING, GORDON. Review of Allen's Treatment of Nature in the Poetry of the Roman Republic, 91–3
Langobardi from *barda* 'axe,' 95
Latin: haud, 443; nihil, 445; quoque, 303–9; sublimen, 345.
Latin etymologies: augur, 469; crāpula, fōrma, iūbilum, lūror, 178; nimbus, oblivio, 179; paenitet, piget, 198; plens (?), 465; pudet, repudium, 197; scalpo, sculpo, 465; taedet, tardus, 199.
Latin, Silver, Prohibitives in, 154–69
Subjunctive in *si*-clauses, 260–73
LEACH, ABBY. Athenian Democracy in the Light of Greek Literature, 361–77
Legrand's Etude sur Théocrite (noticed), 350–53
Leukarion, not Deukalion, 345
Licinus' reference to Ennius, 101
Lidén's Studien zur altindischen u. vergleichenden Sprachgeschichte (noticed), 112
Liutprand and Juvenal, 466
Livy, XXII 17, 2; 46, 5; 57, 5 (emended), 347
Longinus and the περὶ ὕψους, 94, 95
Lucilius, Horace and, 121 foll.
Lucretian Emendations, 183–7
I 555, 186
III 388, 187
III 453, 183
III 462, 184
IV 428, 184
V 703, 185
VI 29, 185
Lycophron 245, 98

Machiavelli and the Elizabethan Drama, 224
Macrobius and Servius, 170–71
MSS, Illustrated, of Terence, 348
Melinno's Ode on Rome, Metrical structure of, 102
Menander, Γεωργός, 100
Date of, 60, 61
MERRILL, W. A. Some Lucretian Emendations, 183–7
Merry's Aristophanes' Peace (noticed), 229 foll.
MILLS, L. H. Items from the Gāthic Pahlavi, 287–93
Minsi-Delaware Dialect, Notes on the Modern, 295–302
Monier-Williams' Sanskrit Dictionary (rev.), 383–7
Municeps, 347
Müller, Wilhelm, and the German Volkslied, 336–8
MUSTARD, WILFRED P. Tennyson and Homer, 143–53
Report of Rheinisches Museum, 468–9

Names, Translations of, 463
Nature, Treatment of, in the Poetry of the Roman Republic, 91–3
Navarre's Essai sur la rhétorique grecque, 472
Negatives, Greek and Latin, 443–5
Nero, Persius and, 222
NEWHALL, BARKER. Report of Hermes, 94–8
Nonius Marcellus, MSS of, 345
NUTTING, H. C. Cicero's Use of Subjunctives in *si*-Clauses, 260–73

Digitized by Google

Ocean, The, in Sanskrit Epic Poetry, 378–86
Osgood, C. G. Report of Englische Studien, 223–8
Osgood's Classical Mythology of Milton's English Poems (noticed), 234
Oxyrhynchos papyri, 95

Pallis's Iliad (noticed), 233
Papyrus Fragment of Iliad E, 310–14
Parmenides 3 emended, 95
Patin's Parmenides im Kampfe gegen Heraklit (rev.), 200–16
Peloponnesian war, The year before the, 97
Periphrasis in Greek, 473
Persius and Nero, 222
and the Theory of Satire, 138 foll.
Petronius and the Greek Romance, 97
Philip of Macedon, Death of, 96
Philistus, Plutarch's use of, 96
Philologus, Report of, 344, 463
Phonetics in Teaching, 225
Pindar, Pyth. V 17, 475
Pindaric chronology, 470
Piso, The annalist, 463
Platner, Samuel Ball. The MSS of Cicero's Letters in the Vatican Library, 420–32
Plato, Philebus, Exegetical and critical notes on, 99
Plautus, Asin. 366, 464
Plautus' Casina and Diphilus' Κληρούμενοι, 102
Truculentus 330, 360, 406, 856, 862, 954, 97
Plutarch's Nicias, 96
περὶ μουσικῆς, Weil and Reinach, ed. (rev.), 331–3
Poseidippus, Newly Discovered Elegy of, Notes on the, 76–7
Poseidonius, History of, 344
Prince, J. Dyneley. Notes on the Modern Minsi-Delaware Dialect, 295–302
Report of Beiträge zur Assyriologie, 103–6
Prohibitives in Silver Latin, 154–69
Propertius, Rothstein's (rev.), 460–62
Dedicatory elegy of the last book, 102
Proverb, A Greek, 464

Quoque, 303–9

Recent Publications, 113–16, 236–8, 355–7, 477–80
Recurrent words and sounds in lyric poetry, 100
Reiter's Euripides auf Tauris (noticed), 111, 112
Reports:
Beiträge zur Assyriologie, 103–6
Englische Studien, 223–8
Hermes, 94–8
Journal of Germanic Philology, 334–43
Philologus, 344–9, 463–7
Revue de Philologie, 217–23
Rheinisches Museum, 99–103
Reviews:
Allen's Treatment of Nature in the Poetry of the Roman Republic, 91–3
Bennett's Critique of Some Recent Subjunctive Theories, 80–91
Brugmann's Griechische Grammatik, 3te Aufl., 317–22
Monier-Williams' Sanskrit Dictionary, 323–7
Patin's Parmenides, 200–16
Rothstein's Propertius, 460–62
Smyth's Greek Melic Poets, 327–31
Weil and Reinach's Plutarque, De la musique, 331–3
Revue de Philologie, Report of, 217–23
Rheinisches Museum, Report of, 99–103, 468–9
Rhetor. ad Alexandrum, not by Anaximenes, 98
Rhetoric, Greek, 472
Rice, John Wesley. On the Septuagint Text I Sam. 20, 3 and the Epistle of Jeremiah 26, 445–7
Rig-Veda, The Wedding Stanza, x. 40. 10, 411–19
Roman Fleet, History of, 466
Roman Forum, IS in, 469
Roman loan to Salamis, 95
Roman Ritual, 466
Romance, Greek, Petronius and the, 97
Rothstein's Propertius (rev.), 460–62
Runes, Origin of the, 339

St. Cuthbert, M.E. Life of, 225
Sallust. Iug. 18, 465
Sandys' Demosthenes on the Peace (noticed), 110
Sanskrit Epic Poetry, The Ocean in, 378–86
Sappho's Farewell to Virginity, 102
Satire, Theory of, and Persius, 138 foll.
Saturnian verse, 217
Schlutter, Otto B. Some Celtic Traces in the Glosses, 188–92
See, *Der* and *Die*, 335
Septuagint Text of I Sam. 20, 3, 445
Sequence of Tenses in Caesar, 109
Servius, Notes on, 170–77
Shorey, Paul. Review of Patin's Parmenides im Kampfe gegen Heraklit, 200–16
Silver Latin, Prohibitives in, 154–69
Singular for plural (English), 225
Slaves in Athens, Public, 98
Smith, Kirby Flower. Review of Rothstein's Propertius, 460–62
Smyth's Greek Melic Poets (rev.), 327–31

Digitized by Google

Sophocles, O. R., The characters, 93
425, 900, 1091, 1264, 1280, 93
Sotairos IS, 95
Spieker, E. H. Review of Smyth's Greek Melic Poets, 327–31
Steele, R. B. Notes on Servius, 170–77
The Greek in Cicero's Epistles, 387–410
Stoic philosophy and its influence on the Monarchist heresy, 103
Stone, Swearing by, 464
Sweet's Dictionary of A.S., 226

Tacitus, Dialogus de Oratoribus, 222
Tennyson and Homer, 143–53
Terence, Adelph. 55–6, 346
Terret's Homère, 218
Theocritus, VII 72–2, 98
Legrand's, 349–53
Scholia, 95
Theodectas, Date of, 39–41
Theognis collection, 98
Thesis and *Dynamis*, 347
Thompson, Sir E. M. Catulliana, 78, 79
Thucydides, IV 63, 1, 101
VII 75, 469
Timagenes of Alexandria, 467
Tragic Poets, Chronological Studies in the Greek, 38–45
Tyrtaeus, the work of a Laconizing Athenian, 97

Uhland's earliest ballad, 234

Valerius Flaccus, 217
Vergil, Eclogue I, Idea of, 100
Georg. I 489–92, 221

Walker's Sequence of Tenses (noticed), 109
Watson's, Thomas, Italian Madrigals Englished, 338
Weil's Études sur l'antiquité grecque (noticed), 235
Wenzelbibel, The, 62–75
Wilhelm on ἐτος and ἐνιαυτός, 357
Wood, Francis A. Etymological Miscellany, 178–82
Worship of the old gods of Greece, Decline of, 102

Xenophon, Anab. II 6, 98
Prepositions in, 354

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

5352 5

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

This book should be retu
n before the



Digitized by Google

Widener Library
3 2044 098 628 480

Digitized by Google